ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY
ET MON

University of London

SHL
WITHDRAWN

63 Periodicals
Royal

23 JUL 19

TRANSACTIONS

OF THE

ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY

The Society as a body is not responsible for the opinions advanced in the following pages

TRANSACTIONS

OF THE

ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Third Series.

VOL. VI.

LONDON
OFFICES OF THE SOCIETY
7 SOUTH SQUARE, GRAY'S INN, W.C.
1912

BIBL.
LONDIN.
WITHDRAWN

CONTENTS

PAGE

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS. By the VEN. ARCHDEACON W. CUNNINGHAM, D.D., LL.D., F.B.A., *President.* (*Delivered February* 15, 1912.) THE FAMILY AS A POLITICAL UNIT. 1

Lessons of the Glasgow Historical Exhibition—The influence of great families on English and Scottish history—The influence of family life in mediæval Scotland—The clan system—Consistent with commercial progress and an advanced civilisation—Contrast between the feudal system in England and in Scotland—The patriarchal character of the latter system—Its military weakness and lack of political coherence—Its unfavourable economic conditions—The effect of the tribal system on the Church—Progress of the royal authority in later times—Peculiarities of Scottish mediæval tenures—Amelioration due to migrations—The interest of these studies in connection with the new Chair of Scottish History at Glasgow.

THE REIGN OF CHARLES I. By PROFESSOR C. H. FIRTH, F.B.A., V.-P., R.Hist.S. (*Read May* 16, 1912) . . . 19

Ballads of the early years of the reign—Relating to the Thirty Years' War—Ballads by Martin Parker and Lawrence Price—Ballads on the overcrowding of London—Economic ballads—Political satires—The Short Parliament and the battle of Newburn—Ballads against Laud and Strafford—Ballads during the Long Parliament and the Civil War—Ballads on the execution of Charles I.—Ballads referring to the Second Civil War and the Restoration.

SOME ASPECTS OF CASTLEREAGH'S FOREIGN POLICY. By CHARLES K. WEBSTER, M.A., F.R.Hist.S. (*Read November* 16, 1912) 65

A brief consideration of the value of the Foreign Office documents of the years 1814–1822—Castlereagh's Projet de Déclaration at the Congress of Vienna—His description of the proposal in a dispatch of February 13, 1815—Its connection with the proposal to guarantee the dominions of the Porte—Its influence on Alexander—The relations of Castlereagh and Metternich

PAGE

1815–1817—Reasons for close alliance of England and Austria at end of 1815—Castlereagh not unaware of Metternich's real character—Castlereagh's attitude towards Russia—Attempt of Metternich to form a secret alliance with England—Castlereagh's peremptory refusal.

THE PARISH CLERGY OF THE THIRTEENTH AND FOURTEENTH CENTURIES. (ALEXANDER PRIZE ESSAY.) By H. G. RICHARDSON, M.A., B.Sc. (*Read June* 20, 1912) . . 89

The thirteenth and fourteenth centuries a convenient starting point for the study of the parish clergy of the Middle Ages—Who were the parish clergy—Their houses and their housefellows—The position of the parish clergy in relation to the agricultural community and to trade—Their income—Their social position and influence—Appendix on the parish clergy and marriage—Appendix on the education of the parish clergy—Bibliography

THE COMMONWEALTH CHARTERS. By B. L. K. HENDERSON, M.A., F.R.Hist.S. (*Read March* 21, 1912) . . . 129

Printed text of Salisbury charter—Operations of Committee for Corporations—Composition of that Committee—Classification of Cromwell's charters—Six typical municipal charters—Views of Dr. Gardiner and Mr. Round on the Colchester charter—Reading and its charter—Election of Sir John Barkstead—Ejection of Cromwell's partisans—The major-generals and the election of 1656—The significance of a geographical grouping of the chartered towns—The fate of Cromwell's charters—King's Lynn, Chipping Wycombe, St. Albans, Leeds—The surviving charters—Salisbury and Swansea at the Restoration—The Petitions of 1660 and 1661—Appendix: List of town charters under the Protectorate.

THE EASTLAND COMPANY IN PRUSSIA, 1579–1585. By PROFESSOR A. SZELAGOWSKI and N. S. B. GRAS, Ph.D. (Harvard). (*Read December* 21, 1911) 163

Early history of the Eastland Company—Rivalry of Dantzic and Elbing in this period—Foreign alliances and intrigues—English merchants at Elbing—Merchants, Adventurers and Hansards—Attitude of Poland and England towards the Hanse—Position of Lübeck—High-handed policy of Dantzic—Establishment of the English Eastland Company at Elbing—Terms of the settlement—The Diet of Augsburg, 1582—Further negotiations and final agreement between the English and Elbingers—Congress of Lublin and royal Commissions—Recommendations of the Commissioners—Effect of

PAGE

the findings on the position of Dantzic—Progress of Elbing—Relative positions of the Eastlanders, Merchant Adventurers and Hansards in the seventeenth century.

THE RECORDS OF THE ENGLISH AFRICAN COMPANIES. By HILARY JENKINSON, B.A., F.S.A., F.R.Hist.S. (*Read January* 18, 1912) 185

I. *Scope of the paper*—Its possibilities as matter for a study in 'Diplomatic'—Records: their nature and consequent rules for studying them—Natural arrangement and artificial classification—Supplementary sources.

II. *The African Companies*—Comparison with other companies and lines of inquiry in present paper—Short study of the history of the companies—Early expeditions to West Africa (*C.* 1450)—English expeditions (1481–1565)—Struggles with the Portuguese—The first charter (1588)—Subsequent charters—The charters of 1660 and 1662.

III. *The Records of the Companies*—Special features of the Records of the period—The account class—The State Paper class—The printed class—History of the documents—The Records of the first company (1660)—The Records of the second company (1672–1750)—The beginning of classified Record keeping—The Records of the third company.

IV. *Lines of Research*—The slave trade—Prices—Numbers—The Middle Passage—The history of the companies—Their connection with foreign politics and the Public Records—Their monopoly—Subsidisation by the Exchequer—Stock, stockholders and members—The companies in Africa—The servants of the companies.

V. *Conclusion.*

INDEX 221

TRANSACTIONS

OF THE

ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

By the Ven. Archdeacon W. CUNNINGHAM, D.D., LL.D., F.B.A.,
President

Delivered February 15, 1912

THE FAMILY AS A POLITICAL UNIT

So far as historical studies are concerned the most interesting event of the past year has been the magnificent Historical Exhibition which was held in Glasgow. The promoters had in view, as their ultimate object, the establishment of a Chair of Scottish History in the University of Glasgow; and they have been successful in securing the nucleus of a sufficient endowment for this purpose. But the Exhibition itself was so admirably planned, and so successfully carried out, that it must have had an enormous effect in diffusing an interest in the records and the relics of the past. The large amount of space which was rightly devoted to ecclesiastical history was in itself a reminder of the importance of religion in the seventeenth century as a factor in the growth of Scottish nationality.[1] Even more significant was the extraordinary collection of treasures that had

[1] *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 3rd Series, v. 13.

been preserved in Scottish mansions, and of portraits which were now generously lent and carefully arranged for display to the public. It helps to bring out the importance of family history for a proper understanding of Scottish affairs. Just because the consolidation of Scottish nationality was so long in being attained, the struggles of the great families continued to furnish the leading motives and incidents in the drama of Scottish history.

Great families exercised a dominating influence in English history during the Wars of the Roses, and again in the eighteenth century; but even in the earlier period, and certainly in the later, the constitutional system of the country was firmly established, and the great families were able to control it by their social importance and their wealth. But in Scotland the great families were able to exercise their influence apart from any organs of national government; the family continued to be a unit for the exercise of political functions; it was not that the family could influence political life, but that it served as the organ through which activities, which we call political, were carried on. And hence Scottish history furnishes us with a type of political institution which has roused the strongest sentiments of personal devotion, and clothes itself in noble romance, but which we in England have outlived. The Parliament Act and the current disparagement of the hereditary principle may leave the social influence of the aristocracy unaffected; but it has been a final blow at their importance as organs of political power.

I

In the ancient world, the city with its definitely marked area was a well-defined unit for the purposes of political life. The religion of the city, the government of the city, the defence of the city, and the alliances of the city could be

definitely organised; and the public, in whose interests these services were performed, was a well-known public, each member of which had a definite status. The whole rested on a territorial basis; and the political life of the great nations also rests on a territorial basis. But where the family is the unit of political life, there can be no such clear definition; it is more amorphous. There is less cohesion in the group; the family, with its derivatives the tribe and the clan, is held together by personal relationships, natural or artificial.[1] The area of country claimed by each tribal unit often depends on tradition and customs which are imperfectly established. The relations with their immediate neighbours are matters of pressing importance to a clan; while the events of the great world roll on and may leave them unconcerned, or only remotely affected. Military activities and economic problems have to be faced, but they take entirely different shapes in such a community from those which they assume in civilisations which are more strictly territorial in character. Family ties were the ultimate cohesive forces in Scotland generally, and especially on the Borders and in the Highlands, throughout the Middle Ages; and in the Highlands they continued to be of supreme importance till a much later date.

The existence and prosperity of the clan depended primarily on its ability to hold its own against other clans, and thus on its fighting strength; and the whole society took its tone from this characteristic. The mutual relation of the chief and his men was based on ties of blood, or on artificial but personal relationship; but it consisted on the one side in personal care for his clansmen, both in battle and in peace, and on the other in entire devotion to the person of the chief and obedience to him. The religious sentiment towards the ancestral founder of a city, which held such a large place in ancient communities, appears to have been absent in Christian times; the whole

[1] W. M. Mackenzie, *The Clans, their Origin and Nature*, in *Home Life of the Highlanders*, 1911.

sense of loyalty was concentrated on the personality of the living chief, who was the leader in war. This mutual feeling—rather than any defined rights—governed the internal relations of the community; military requirements involved an absolute obedience. There might be cases where the chief did not scruple to play upon it, and this would lead to gross oppression; but apart from exceptional incidents, the principle on which the system rested interfered with the formulating and enforcing, in any regular way, of the rights of the subject as against the ruler.

While internal rule took this military colouring, any infringement of the claims of one clan by another could only be settled in the last resort by fighting. It was not merely that there were frequent raids between neighbours who were rivals, but that the solemn ordeal of battle supplied the only known means by which a decision could be reached. It was thus that very early a long-continued struggle between the Clan Chattan and the Clan Kay came to a head at the great contest on the North Inch of Perth.[1] There seems to have been a similar decision by ordeal of battle in the feud between the Armstrongs and the Grahams,[2] while the Laws of the Marches (1249) retain a tradition of single combat as the legitimate method of settling certain disputes.[3]

This dominance of military considerations affected the whole community, and determined the forms of its economic life. This was of a primitive character; cultivation was carried on in favourable situations, but the main subsistence came from cattle-breeding and pasture farming. Defence against raids, and effective means for the recovery of stolen cattle, were the first essentials for prosperity; if there were ample food supplies, the tribe had the means of increasing in fighting strength; if the food was cut off the fighting strength must decline. A community which

[1] Neilson, *Trial by Combat*, 244.
[2] J. Graham, *Condition of the Border at the Union*, p. 18.
[3] Nicolson, *Leges Marchiarum*, 3.

maintained its livelihood in such a simple fashion was readily capable of expansion by absorbing neighbouring lands, and it had great facilities for migration. There was no such stability about the social system as if it had been built on a defined territorial basis.

In the interesting address which Lord Rosebery delivered last September as Rector of St. Andrews University, he appeared to neglect the possibilities of skill and culture which are compatible with this tribal system of society. The miseries of the fourteenth century in Scotland were not the results of local feuds and tribal jealousies; so long as the disputes were merely tribal and local, progress had been possible. The commerce of the town of Berwick [1] flourished greatly till the time when the Borders became the scene of invasions organised on national lines; 'in a material point of view, it may safely be affirmed that Scotland, at the death of Alexander III., was more civilised and more prosperous than at any period of her existence, down to the time when she ceased to be a separate kingdom in 1707.' [2] So, too, in the Highlands. The arms of the sea which run into Inverness-shire and Argyllshire afforded excellent harbourage and admirable opportunities for trade by sea-going vessels far into the Highlands. The fact of Norse settlement in the Hebrides at any rate suggests that these opportunities had been taken advantage of, at times from which no record survives. The skins of martens and other wild animals were valuable articles of commerce; and the herring and other fish, with which the sealochs abound, would come into demand so soon as there was any skill in curing them. Hides and wool were also available for export; and French wines were in considerable demand. In all probability there were better opportunities for the Highlanders and for the men of the Lords of the Isles to come into direct contact with the

[1] Burton, *History of Scotland*, ii. 53, 94.

[2] C. Innes, *Liber S. Thome Aberbrothoc* (Bannatyne Club), Pref. xxix.

civilisation of the continent than there were for Englishmen before the time of the Crusades. It is academic pedantry to represent the Scottish Highlanders as given over to utter barbarism, because their conceptions of law and order and their methods of enforcing them differed from our own.

II

It is hardly possible to exaggerate the contrast between a social system organised on this basis, and the centralised system which has existed in England since the time of the Norman Conquest. The owner of any land in England derived his rights and his judicial authority from the Crown ; but on the Borders the Lord of Ettrick continued to maintain, in the sixteenth century, that his authority required no such warrant for its exercise,[1] and there was a similar feeling all through the Highlands. The chiefs held sway over the tribe by customary and patriarchal authority ; this was the ultimate ground on which law and order rested and by means of which it could be enforced ; by a system of intertribal connexions and alliances loose confederations of a more or less permanent character could be brought into being.[2] The tribal authority of each chief was the foundation of the system ; and the whole history of Scotland is the story of the struggle of this social system to maintain itself against the encroachments of a system of law and order which emanated from a central authority, and which endeavoured by fair means or foul to superimpose itself on a more flexible and less stable social system.

Of the story of that struggle during its last phases in the Highlands I do not propose to speak. I only desire to call attention to Scottish history as furnishing abundant and interesting illustration of the tribe or the family as

[1] Maxwell, *Story of the Tweed*, 45.

[2] The power of the Douglases is exemplified in the treaty with the Percys in 1384. Nicolson, *Leges Marchiarum*, 384.

exercising political functions, and to the light which is thus thrown on the conditions of any community, ancient or modern, in which the family has been the political unit. Such a brief examination will at least serve to bring out some of its defects, and thus to show that, with all its attractiveness and romance, the system could not survive.

1. The military system was admirably adapted for conflicts which called for a display of personal valour, but it was unsuited for organised warfare of any kind. The melting away of the Highland troops, after the battle of Kilsyth, rendered it impossible for the Marquis of Montrose to follow up his great victory, and led to the ruin of the cause for which he had fought. In the final struggle at Culloden the English troops showed real discipline, while the jealousies of different clans as to precedence proved to be a fatal cause of weakness. Culloden was not merely the victory of an English general commanding an English army, it was a demonstration of the ineffectiveness of the military system of the clans in organised warfare.

2. There was very little possibility of political progress in such a society. In England it was possible to rally opposition to the Crown on grounds which were really of public interest, and where matters of principle were involved. The opposition to King John took shape, not merely in the resistance of barons each of whom felt personally aggrieved, but in laying down principles of good government which ought to be observed. The protests against foreign favourites could be made to bear the semblance of the action of a national party. Some sort of underlying principle can be recognised all through the kaleidoscope of the Angevin and Plantagenet reigns. Something more was involved than mere personal interests; there was an approximation to the emergence of a party with a programme of action that was requisite for the good of the State.

But in Scotland generally this could not be the case. The agreements and alliances were formed according to personal affinities, and not on any recognisable ground of

public policy. Until there was some sort of national cohesion and national consciousness, it was hardly possible to formulate any principle of national independence, though there were plenty of men who were ready, for various reasons, to maintain their personal independence of the English Crown. On the Borders there were men who aimed at a semi-regality, such as the Earls of Hereford and Shrewsbury exercised in the Marches of Wales.[1] Many Highlanders were favourable to the claims of Edward I—not because they approved of a centralised, feudal rule, but because they were opposed to it, and preferred a more distant, and presumably less effective, to a neighbouring liege lord whose interference might be more frequent and more inconvenient. The attitude of the Lords of the Isles in the struggle which ended at Bannockburn can be best explained on such grounds. The Scottish clergy were the very backbone of the resistance in which Wallace and Bruce were leaders; but Scottish clergy were for the most part more concerned in repelling any supervision by the Archbishop of York.[2] The cruelties of the capture of Berwick[3] roused the opposition of the trading interests in Scottish burghs,[4] which might have been quite disposed to welcome a king who was so ready to foster municipal life. The struggle broke through the family interest which had linked parts of England and parts of Scotland together; but its main result was to define the limits of English power, and close the channels of English influence. It is very hard to detect any principle round which the various elements rallied at this great crisis in Scottish history.

All through Scottish history, until the era of the Reformation and the rise of Presbyterianism, it is not easy to trace any definite principles, or any parties founded on

[1] Skeel, *The Council of the Marches of Wales.*

[2] A. Lang, *History of Scotland*, i. 114, 165.

[3] Burton, *op. cit.* ii. 168.

[4] The Flemish residence was burned in the sack of Berwick. Scotland at this time seems to have had commercial relations with the Baltic. Burton, *op. cit.* ii. 194.

principles. There were personalities who cherished ambitions and rallied their friends around them, and personalities who formed bands for their mutual advantage, but there was no progress in political life. Even in subsequent periods this continued to be the case; principles might be worn as badges, but personalities were the inspiring points of rallying. Mary Stuart won enthusiastic support from numbers who suffered in her cause, and the personalities of Montrose and of Argyle stand out as giving vitality to the causes which they championed. The last rising of the Highlanders was not called forth in defence of the principle of hereditary succession, or of the independence of the Scottish Crown, or in opposition to Presbyterianism, but simply by attachment to Prince Charlie as a person to whom they looked for the redress of grievances of every kind. Scotland had never known an effective division of parties based on differences of principle till the time of the Covenanters, and there was much compromise before the party which represented their principles prevailed. We may deplore the evils of party government, but it is still more serious when the political life is dominated by personal preference and personal affinities, and there is no need for the formulating of principles and the formation of parties based on principles. A society in which personality dominates and principles are of little account is on a low plane of political life, and is incapable of real progress.

3. Tribal society, as it continued to exist in the Highlands, afforded as little opportunity for economic as for political progress. The rights of the chief over the clansmen were undefined and therefore unlimited; he was entitled to support, and miserable oppression was sure to result when he was unscrupulous in interpreting and extorting support. The conditions of society, with frequent warfare, were not favourable to steady labour, and the uncertainty in regard to enjoying the fruits of labour removed any incentive to hard work. The very appearance of prosperity might give an excuse for fresh exactions. The demands were hardly

economic in character; to a very small extent could they be considered as rent, or bargains between the owner of land and the man who worked it; to a much larger extent they were of the nature of taxes, contributed to the chief as the head of a political unit. Coign and livery were the recognised forms of taxation; and while in England the definition of the payments for which any locality was liable is set forth in Domesday Book, the fine continued to be the arbitrary instrument of taxation among the Celtic peoples in Wales and Ireland as well as in Scotland. This uncertainty was an insuperable barrier to progress; it not only discouraged any inclination to labour, but it prevented the introduction of permanent improvements. Sir John Davis's account of the condition of Ireland in the time of James I affords an illustration of the working of this tendency. 'The uncertainty of estates hath been the true cause of such desolation and barbarism in this land, as the like was never seen in any country that professed the name of Christ; for though the Irish be a nation of great antiquity, and wanted neither wit nor valour . . . and were lovers of music, poetry and all kind of learning, and possessed a mind abounding with all things necessary for the civil life of man; yet they never did build any houses of brick and stone, some few religious houses excepted. . . . Neither did any of them in all this time plant any gardens or orchards, inclose or improve their lands, live together in settled villages or towns, nor make any provision for posterity; which being against all common sense and reason must be needs imputed to those unreasonable customs which made their estates so transitory and uncertain in their possessions.' [1]

4. Such tribal society, then, had deep-seated defects, both military and economic, it could not ultimately survive in the struggle for existence; but it had a vigorous life which was capable of remodelling and absorbing extraneous

[1] Sir J. Davis, *A discoverie of the True Causes why Ireland was never entirely subdued*, in a *Collection of Tracts and Treatises illustrative of the Political State of Ireland*, i. 667.

elements. The manner in which the Norman settlers, both in Inverness-shire and in Ireland, were led to accommodate themselves to their environment, till they became Celtic, not in blood, but in habits and customs, is one illustration of the power of assimilation which the tribal system possessed. But even more striking evidence is afforded by the characteristics of the Celtic churches. Within the area of the old Roman Empire, where cities had been established as the centres of each district, ecclesiastical organisation had taken a definitely territorial type, and the bishop was an authority over a city and its surrounding lands. But when Christianity began to permeate a tribal society, ecclesiastical organisation adapted itself to the existing social system.[1] The bishop was a mere official in a monastery which was endowed out of the lands of a tribe, and the real government was in the hands of the abbot, who was always a blood relation of the chief. The great benefit which the papacy conferred on the world, in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, was the maintenance of the conception of spiritual independence, and the determination that the power and property of the Church should not be wrested to their own purposes by men like Rufus. Secular authority and secular power was very deeply entrenched in the very constitution of the churches in Scotland and Wales. It was necessary not merely to deal with the one civil ruler of a realm, but to oppose the claims of a separate Rufus in every valley. The success of Norman ecclesiastics in bringing the Celtic churches into line with the rest of Latin Christendom, both in Ireland, Wales, and Scotland, was necessary in order to prevent them from being hopelessly secularised by any of the chiefs who kept a monastery under his sway. The Celtic churches had produced anchorites of devout life and masters of sacred learning, and had sent out heroes of missionary effort; but they were not so organised as to be able to maintain the sense of spiritual independence of human

[1] Skene, *Celtic Scotland*, ii. 67; Willis Bund, *The Celtic Church in Wales*.

authority. So long as it lasted there was a danger that the consciousness of the supremacy of the spiritual in human affairs would be lost, and that the Church would forfeit all power of leavening the world.

III

A veneer of national authority had been spread over the whole of Scotland during the reigns from Malcolm Canmore to Robert the Bruce, and some progress had been made in translating the traditional relations of chiefs and men into terms in which they could be defined and recorded as mutual obligations; but the long minorities, which ensued again and again, rendered it impossible for the Crown to assert its authority steadily and persistently. There was little serious attempt to make the royal authority a reality after the death of Bruce till the time when James VI was able to hold the reins of government. He set himself to put down the more mischievous Celtic customs by means of the Statutes of Iona,[1] and was anxious to give the new system fair play by eliminating and transplanting the disorderly elements. The opportunity lay ready to hand; there was plenty of work for new settlers in Ireland. The unruly septs might make useful colonists, if they obtained lands on fair terms and on a secure tenure, in districts where the old blood feuds could be forgotten; the more unruly elements might work off their energies by defending the new settlements against the wild Irish. The MacDonnells were successful in obtaining a recognised position in Antrim, after many vicissitudes: and the Grahams, who were noted for horse stealing and other crimes,[2] were made the scapegoats of disorder in Eskdale,[3] and were deported to the wilds of Connaught. The promotion of plantation was a main plank

[1] Duke of Argyll, *Scotland as it was*, i. 218.

[2] *State Papers, Scotland*, Border Papers, ii. 141, 687.

[3] Lord Muncaster's MSS., *Tenth Report of Hist. MSS. Commission*, p. 254 (May 5, 1606); p. 258 (June 24, 1606).

in James's scheme for at once settling the Highlands and the Borders, and developing the resources of some sparsely populated districts in other parts of his realm; and the tribe, or clan, proved to be a useful instrument for carrying this policy into effect. When this social group was no longer allowed to exercise political functions on its own account, it could still be utilised as a suitable organ by which a most important step in progress could be effected.

These deportations were terribly harsh, but they were rendered more possible because of the comparatively slight attachment of men, who were chiefly engaged in cattle breeding, to the soil. All over Scotland the tenantry were much less strictly rooted to the soil than was the case in England or in continental countries. Differences in the management of land, which were due to economic causes, gave opportunity for greater detachment. By far the most important elements in the Scottish husbandry were sheep and cattle farming, and the growing of corn was of little account; the amount of land that was used for cultivation was comparatively small, and there were few large manorial farms for which a constant supply of labour was required. The most advanced estate management was probably found on the lands of the large monasteries in Berwickshire and Tweeddale; but even there the main work appears to have been done by landless men who formed part of the establishment. There are no signs of villeins who had holdings of their own on the condition of working regularly week by week on the domain lands. In the rental of Kelso of 1290[1] we read of cotters and other tenants who held land and who did *precariae*, but not of men who were responsible for regular week-work. The predial services were of little account, and there was no peasantry rooted to the soil by personal obligations, such as we find in manors all over England. The main obligations of the tenant to his lord could be discharged by payments in kind and did not involve the rendering of

[1] Cosmo Innes, *Scotland in the Middle Ages*, 243.

personal service. It is often remarked that in Scotland villein-tenure passed away early, but in the form in which it left such a lasting impression in England it never existed. The Scottish bondmen, who had been mere chattels, did not persist as a permanent element in the community; in their earlier servitude they appear to have been subject to compulsory transplantation and had no root in the soil.

The steel-bow tenure, so widely diffused in Scotland, where the lord supplied the seed and stock as well as the land, gave facilities for planting out bondmen on land in the form of tenants who had no economic attachment to the soil, and on whose legal disabilities it was rarely of advantage to insist. From the earliest times there were regulations as to the outgoing and incoming tenants, which presuppose a high degree of economic freedom,[1] and leave no room for the exaction of regular predial services.[2] Since this was the case on estates in the Lowlands organised under Anglo-Norman influence, it is easy to see that in the Highlands, where many of the chiefs had no domain farms but depended entirely on supplies obtained from their tenants,[3] there was no villeinage which involved the payment of regular predial services and therefore no astriction to the soil. The freedom of movement was far greater than it could be in England, and migration did not involve the tearing up of any roots.

The opportunity that was thus afforded for freedom of movement was taken advantage of by the Scots from very early times.[4] The North of England had been left miserably desolate by William the Conqueror after the northern rebellion, and there seems to have been a steady percolation of Scotsmen into that district. There are many traces of

[1] Duke of Argyll, *op. cit.* i. 3.

[2] Compare the status of bondmen in *Quoniam Attachiamenta* in *Acts of Parliament of Scottand*, i. 655; also the social conditions indicated in connexion with bonds of Manrent. J. Bartholomew, *Juridical Review*, xxiii. 42.

[3] Argyll, *Scotland*, i. 147.

[4] This is the condition which gives a curiously modern character to much of the economic history of a backward part of Great Britain.

this movement, and there is no reason to regard these instances as exceptional in any other sense than that they happen to have been recorded.[1] The Scot was free to go on foreign travel if he chose; and apparently many did choose, and settled down in lands which proved attractive. The influx of Scots pedlars and of Scots settlers into Scandinavia and the Baltic lands in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is quite as remarkable as the Scots invasion of the North of England in the later Middle Ages. In any land which had been temporarily desolated by civil war, the Scot saw an opening which he might be able to turn to account.

Tribal sentiment and clan feeling helped to give a different character to migration, and to enable it to take place on a large scale in groups of settlers. The compulsory migration of bondmen may be regarded as an anticipation of the migration by which the pressure of population was relieved, and new lands were occupied by some septs under the leadership of their chief or a scion of his house. The recognition of the rights of the MacDonnells in Antrim[2] and the increased immigration from Kintyre gave them more scope than they had enjoyed on their narrow peninsula, while the settlement proved to be an extension of the settled area in Ireland, as it adjoined the great plantation at Derry which was financed by the London companies. The district the MacDonnells had evacuated came to be a haven of refuge for the Covenanters who were driven out of Ayrshire in the 'killing time,' since they were welcomed as tenants and planted on holdings by the Earl of Argyll.[3] These migrations and plantations had become so frequent that Scotsmen were specially fitted to take the advantage that opened

[1] Miss M. Sellers, *Economic and Social History*, in *Victoria County History*, *Yorkshire*, ii.; R. Davies, *Walk through York*, 126; *Richard of Devizes* in *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II. and Richard I.*, R. S. iii. 437.

[2] G. Hill, *MacDonnells of Antrim*, 197, 207.

[3] Duke of Argyll, *op. cit.* i. 285.

up when the settlement of the New World began. Sir William Alexander was a pioneer in organising the settlements which he called Nova Scotia. The Darien Company succumbed through the political complications which it raised with English merchants and Spanish authorities; though its fall ruined Scots enterprise for a generation, it exemplified a new form under which organised migration might be carried on. The Scots settlements planted by the Canada Company in the Huron territory and at Dunedin in New Zealand illustrate the important part which the Scots, with their habitual readiness to migrate, have taken in the building up of the Empire.

. . . . . .

Last year I spoke to the members of this Society on the uncertainty in the connotation of the term 'nation,' and the unsuitability of this conception for many purposes of study; and I felt that additional point was given to my remarks by what I saw on my visit to the Glasgow Exhibition. The success of that project, as we have seen, has brought the establishment of a Chair of Scottish History in Glasgow University within the range of practical action. It may be anticipated that this hope will be realised in the immediate future. I cannot but feel that this foundation will open up a field of research that has been too much neglected—the importance of the family as a political unit. Scottish history has suffered from being studied as if it were a faint reflection of the history of England, where national organisation was so prominent from the time of the Conquest, and where there is a long story of true national life. But Scotland has never been merely a feeble imitation of England; her development has been in many ways independent, and it cannot be properly understood if we persist in viewing it with eyes that are adjusted to the English focus. There is a danger of anachronism if we antedate the effective force of national feeling and forget the long-continued importance of the family as a political unit. Nor is there any other form

of historical study that has more importance for the present day. So long as there is a British Empire, there are likely to be Scotsmen who are ambitious of taking their part in administering its affairs in distant lands. But native populations all over the world are organised on tribal and patriarchal lines rather than as nationalities; the family has been and is the principal unit for political purposes. By studying the history of his own country in this aspect the Scotsman can best prepare himself for administrative work abroad, and learn to enter into the point of view of those whom he may be called upon to help to govern when he goes out into the great world.

THE REIGN OF CHARLES I

By Professor C. H. FIRTH, F.B.A., V.-P., R.Hist.S.

THE reign of Charles I opened with the celebration of the new king's marriage. Charles succeeded his father on March 27, 1625, and Henrietta Maria made her entry into London on June 16. A ballad entitled 'Jack of Lent's Ballad' celebrated the Queen's coming, and described by anticipation the pageants with which the citizens of London received her. In one place she was to be met by St. George with a welcome to St. Denis; in another Jonah was to appear out of the mouth of his whale and promise to supply her with fish on Fridays; elsewhere the Graces and the Fates were to hail her with appropriate remarks about her beauty and her good fortune. Besides these there was to be a figure symbolising the political significance of the marriage. At the Exchange, beside the three Fates,

> 'Spain's Infanta shall stand by
> Wringing her hands, and thus shall cry,
> "I do repent too late."'[1]

Feasts and pageants, however, soon gave place to military preparations. Since the summer of 1624 England had practically been at war with Spain. In June 1624 the English Government had promised to send 6000 men to Holland to serve in the Dutch armies, and in the winter of 1624 twelve thousand men were raised to serve under Mansfield in Germany for the recovery of the Palatinate. Mansfield's army of raw recruits, ill commanded and worse provided, never got farther than Holland, where most of it perished miserably from hardships and starvation during the spring of 1625. In the autumn of 1625 came another fiasco: the expedition to Cadiz which sailed from England early in

[1] *Choice Drollery*, ed. Ebsworth, 1656, p. 20.

October landed near Cadiz on October 23, re-embarked, after its failure, four days later, and returned to England in November.

Failures of this kind were not calculated to inspire songs or ballads. Three stanzas on the Cadiz expedition 'by a gentleman who was present in all that service' are printed in a contemporary history and reprinted by Mr. Ebsworth.[1] There is also a quaint song on the subject preserved in manuscript, jeering at the motley army, and its exploits in the wine cellars of the Spaniards.[2] Men contrasted the glorious deeds of Queen Elizabeth's generals and soldiers against Spain with the conduct of their successors.

Public opinion was outraged not merely by the miscarriage of the Cadiz expedition, but by the acquittal of its commander, Lord Wimbledon, and his chief subordinates. 'The fault,' said a newsletter, 'is laid upon old Captain Gore, the only man who behaved himself well, and an old soldier of the Queen's.'

A song, popular a few years earlier, celebrated the achievements of Drake and Raleigh, and all the many Norrises and Wenmans who had distinguished themselves in the Elizabethan wars. The refrain was:

> 'We are old soldiers of the Queen's,
> And the Queen's old soldiers.'[3]

Another with a similar refrain jeered at the veterans who had emerged from all sorts of odd corners to serve under Vere or Mansfield. It described an old soldier of the Queen's

> 'With an old motley coat and a malmsey nose,
> With an old jerkin that's out at the elbows,
> And an old pair of boots drawn on without hose,
> Stuffed with rags instead of toes.'

[1] *Roxburghe Ballads*, vi. 420.

[2] *MS. Rawlinson Poet.*, 160, f. 183. It begins, 'Phœbus fiery hot and weary.'

[3] *Old Ballads*, 1723–5, iii. 193. The song ends with a verse on 'young Lord Wenman so valiant and bold' who has gone off to fight in the wars of Bohemia. I take this verse to have been added about 1620, when Sir Horace Vere set out to the defence of the Palatinate.

It ended :

'He's now rid to Bohemia to fight with his foes,
And he swears by his valour he'll have better clothes,
Or else he'll lose legs, arms, fingers and toes,
And he'll come again when no man knows.'

A parody of this last now pictured the king's new soldier, with his love-locks, and ribbons, new white boots, a feather in his hat, and a gun that never was shot off.

'He's newly come to sixteen years,
And gone aboard with his mother's tears,
With his new bravadoes, void of fears,
And a new oath by which he swears.'

His exploits, it said, like those of the army sent to Cadiz, would be summed up in drinking old sack.

A fourth song written to the same tune set forth the experiences of a soldier :

'Who went over with Lord Mansfield, and got ne'er a good bit,
But came back into England to learn wit.'

It complains of commanders who cheated the soldiers of their pay, and sergeants and lieutenants only capable of fighting in alehouses.[1]

With armies of raw soldiers raised and organised in a hurry, and badly officered, as well as badly led, defeat was a foregone conclusion. It was in vain that ballad writers sought to inspirit them by exaggerated stories of Elizabethan battles or narratives of fictitious sea-fights. The two best ballads of the time were of this kind. One was the well-known ballad of Lord Willoughby, which retold with imaginative additions the famous battle of Newport in 1601, for the encouragement of the English regiments who were sent to serve in Holland.[2] The other was the ballad of the Angel Gabriel, which related an imaginary fight between a Bristol merchantman and a Spanish man-of-war.[3]

[1] *New Academy of Compliments*, ed. 1713, pp. 239, 242 ; *12th Rep. Hist. MSS. Comm.* pt. ix. p. 549.

[2] See *Transactions*, 3rd Ser. iii. 110.

[3] *Roxburghe Ballads*, vi. 428.

Things went from bad to worse. At the end of 1626 a breach with France took place and a new war began. In June 1627 Buckingham's expedition sailed to the Isle of Rhé, and at the end of October he re-embarked, having lost more than half his army. This time public opinion fixed all the blame of the failure on the Duke himself. As the press was silenced, libellous and satirical songs and verses circulated in manuscript, and a large collection of them was printed in 1850.[1] Several of them deal with the Duke's intended journey to France in 1625, when the French King refused to allow him to enter the country.[2] There are three satirical songs on his taking command of the fleet and setting sail for France. One of the songs prophesied that he would make the proud French tremble as Edward III and as Henry V made them, and not only conquer France, but deliver Bohemia and capture the Spanish plate fleet. 'At last,' says the author,

> 'At last hee is for France,
> After his thus long tarrying,
> Hee stayed but for his victualling,
> And for some kinsfolks marrying.
> But now hee is at sea,
> Where he commands amaine,
> Whence all true Englishmen doe hope
> Hee'l nere come back againe.'[3]

There is a bitter satire on the failure at the Isle of Rhé, in which the Duke is most unjustly accused of cowardice as well as of incapacity,[4] and there are two sets of verses on the attack of the House of Commons on the Duke in the session of 1628.[5] These verse satires are literary productions; if

[1] *Poems and Songs relating to George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham, and his Assassination by John Felton*, edited by F. W. Fairholt, Percy Society, 1850.

[2] Fairholt, pp. 6, 9.

[3] *Ibid.* pp. 10–18.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 19. See also *Diary of John Rous*, p. 19.

[5] Fairholt, pp. 24–32. The verses attributed to Dr. Corbett beginning 'The wisest king did wonder' refer to the second session of the Parliament of 1628 rather than the first. This is confirmed by their position in *Rous's Diary*, where they appear under August 1629, p. 42.

there were ballads written about Parliament's struggle against Buckingham they have not survived. But the popular feeling against Buckingham found vent in an assault on Dr. Lambe, the Duke's physician and confidant, who was so severely handled by a mob of apprentices and sailors that he died of his injuries. The Duke's life was threatened too. A doggerel rhyme became current :

> 'Let Charles and George do what they can
> The Duke shall die like Dr. Lambe.'

Lambe's death is minutely related in a ballad called 'The Tragedy of Dr. Lambe.' [1]

> 'Neighbours cease to mone
> And leave your lamentation :
> For Dr Lambe is gone.
> The devill of our nation,
> As tis knowne . . . . . .
>
> 'For such a wicked wretch
> In England hath lived seldome,
> Nor never such a witch,
> For his skill from hell came
> That made him rich.'

Lambe was killed on June 14, 1628, and the doggerel rhyme proved prophetic ; for Buckingham's assassination by Felton followed on August 23, 1628. In this case too, while a large number of epitaphs and poems on both Buckingham and Felton have reached us, not one of the ballads which must have been written on the subject has survived.

Buckingham was assassinated at Portsmouth, whither he had come to superintend the fitting out of a fleet designed for the relief of Rochelle. A fortnight later the fleet sailed, under the command of the Earl of Lindsey. A verse broadside called 'The Supplication of Great Britain's Friends' represented the Protestants of the Palatinate, Denmark, the Netherlands and Rochelle, praying Charles

[1] *Pepysian Collection.* The ballad is signed M. P., *i.e.* Martin Parker.

for succour, and the Nobility, Clergy, and Commons appealing to the King on their behalf.[1]

> 'Our hearts, our hands, our purses and our lands,
> Our lives and all we offer in this cause,'

began the prayer of the Commons, and ended:

> 'Then in the name of Heaven let us go on
> 'Gainst France and Spain and the brood of Babylon.'[2]

Lindsey's fleet failed to effect its purpose, and the defenders of Rochelle, having lost half their number by famine, capitulated on October 18, 1628. A ballad entitled 'Rochelle her Yielding' relates their sufferings:

> 'God grant that we here dwelling
> May have a fellow-feeling
> Of those Christians' misery,
> Who have endured such sorrow,
> And let us from them borrow,
> A pattern of true constancy.'[3]

The war with France ended in 1629 and that with Spain about a year later.[4] From that period to the beginning of the Scottish rebellion, England, in Clarendon's phrase, 'enjoyed the greatest calm and the fullest measure of felicity that any people in any age for so long a time together have been blessed with. . . .' 'Whilst neighbouring countries,' he continues, 'were engaged, entangled, and some almost destroyed by the rage and fury of arms' the British Isles were 'looked upon as the garden of the world,' and the trade of England 'increased to that degree that we were the Exchange of Christendom.'[5] England took no part in their wars.

[1] The best is Zouch Townley's poem 'To his confined Friend, Mr. Felton.' Fairholt, p. 74. It is also reprinted in Disraeli's *Curiosities of Literature*.

[2] Lemon, *Catalogue of Broadsides in the Possession of the Society of Antiquaries*.

[3] *Pepysian Collection*. For English feeling about Rochelle, see *Diary of Sir S. D'Ewes*, i. 361, 391, 395.

[4] Treaty of Susa, April 14, 1629. Treaty of Madrid, November 5, 1630.

[5] Clarendon, *Rebellion*, i. 159.

She seemed to have lost all interest in the struggle of the Thirty Years' War, which had roused such passionate excitement here when it first began. Educated Puritans, it is true, followed with anxious eyes the fortunes of German Protestantism, exulted at the victories of Gustavus Adolphus and sorrowed at his death. The Diary of Sir Symonds D'Ewes and the letters of Sir John Eliot show that.[1] There were many poems on Gustavus Adolphus and elegies on his death, but to most of the poets the great events happening on the continent were a spectacle performed for their benefit on the stage of the world rather than matters which touched Englishmen personally.[2] The Stationers' Registers show that a certain number of broadside ballads relating to the continental wars were published, but they have all perished.[3] In ballads which survive there are occasional allusions to the English soldiers of fortune who served under the colours of Sweden or France or Holland. One ballad refers to the girls the adventurers left behind them :

'There were three lusty soldiers
Went through a town of late,
The one loved Besse, the other Sisse,
The third loved bouncing Kate.
These maidens were three laundresses
To wash men's shirts and bands,
And for their paines these soldiers gave
Them wages in their hands.'[4]

[1] *Diary of Sir S. D'Ewes*, i. 349, 395 ; ii. 2, 57, 83, 100 ; iii. 128 ; Forster, *Life of Eliot*, ii.

[2] *Randolph's Poems*, ed. Hazlitt, p. 594 ; *King's Poems*, ed. Hannah, p. 66 ; *Carew's Poems*, ed. Ebsworth, p. 114 ; *Diary of John Rous*, p. 73 ; *Fanshawe's Poems*, p. 210, ed. 1676 ; John Russell, *The Two Famous Pitcht Battels of Lypsich and Lutzen, etc.*, 1634.

[3] 'News from Sweathland,' November 4, 1631 ; 'Good News from Bohemia,' January 2, 1632 ; 'A Great and Bloody Fight,' *ibid.* ; 'The Palatinate's Joy,' March 9, 1632 ; 'News from the King of Sweden,' August 3, 1632 ; 'A Mournful Lamentation on the Death of the King of Sweden,' Arber, iv. 229, 268, 274, 282, 299; 'The Complaint of Germany,' February 7, 1638 ; 'Germany's Misery,' April 9, 1638 ; *ibid.* iv. 408, 415.

[4] *Roxburghe Ballads*, i. 109.

Another, to the same tune, celebrates the return of these adventurers:

'There were three lusty soldiers
Had served in France and Spain,
Germany and Italy,
And were come home again:
One in the warres had lost an eye,
Another shot quite through the thigh,
The third in Turkish slavery
Endurèd great pain.'[1]

Taking the ballads of the period from 1629 to 1639 as a whole, judging both from those entered in the Stationers' Registers and from those which have survived, one gathers that popular interest in foreign affairs was decreasing. The Puritan sections of the upper class and the middle class were, for religious reasons, deeply interested in the progress of the Thirty Years' War, but the lower classes and the non-Puritan portion of the population were indifferent. However, an adventure in foreign parts always attracted them. The story of the eight English sailors left behind in Greenland in 1630 and of the shifts by which they contrived to live through the winter, was turned at once into a ballad called 'A Wonder beyond Man's Expectation.'[2] A battle off our own coast, even if Englishmen took no part in it, excited universal curiosity and employed every ballad-maker's pen.

In the summer of 1639 a Spanish fleet consisting of thirty galleons and thirty-six transports sailed from Corunna to the Netherlands, bearing 10,000 soldiers and large sums of money for the supply of the Spanish forces in Flanders. A Dutch fleet under Tromp met it in the Channel, and after a fight lasting from September 6 to September 8 the Spaniards took shelter in the Downs, and appealed to Charles I for protection. Charles was willing to protect them if he was paid for his services; but before the bargain was completed, Tromp, on October 11, 1639, attacked the Spanish fleet, and

[1] 'It is bad jesting with a Halter' (*Pepysian Collection*, i. 440).
[2] *Pepysian Collection*, i. 74.

destroyed or sank most of the ships. About ten ballads on the fight were published at the time, and two of them still survive, viz.: 'A Lamentable Relation of a Fearful Fight at Sea,' by Martin Parker,[1] and 'A New Spanish Tragedy,' by Laurence Price.[2]

Apart from these exceptions the ballads of the period between the dissolution of the King's third Parliament and the beginning of the Scottish war relate entirely to domestic affairs.

The King's visit to Scotland in 1633 inspired half a dozen ballads, only one of which is now extant.[3] Pageants such as the entertainment of Charles by the Inns of Court, or the solemn procession when the Earl of Northumberland was made Knight of the Garter, were narrated in verse.[4] Murders and executions were, as usual, favourite topics. On April 12, 1629, a woman named Catherine Francis was burnt in Smithfield for killing her husband with a pair of scissors.

'Alas, what wretched bloody times
Do we vile sinners live in!
What horrid and what cruel crimes,
Are done in spite of Heaven!
What barbarous murders now are done,
None fouler since the world begun,
O women, murderous women,
Whereon are your minds?'[5]

But the favourite subjects were imaginary incidents

[1] *Ballads and Other Fugitive Poetical Pieces from the Collections of Sir James Balfour*, Edinburgh, 1834, p. 8.

[2] Wood, 401 (157).

[3] 'Blue Cap for Me' (*Roxburghe Ballads*, i. 75). For the lost ballads see *Stationers' Registers*, iv. 270–274, 289.

[4] 'The honour of the Inns of Court,' 1633 (Collier, *Broadside Black-letter Ballads*, p. 112); 'The Triumphant Show made by Earl Percy,' 1635 (*Roxburghe Ballads*, iii. 220).

[5] 'A Warning for Wives' (*Pepysian Collection*, i. 118). There are also ballads on two other wives who murdered their husbands, Alice Davis and Anne Waller, in this collection, i. 122, 124. For other ballads on the murders of this period see *Roxburghe Ballads*, vol. iii. 28, 136, 143, 146, 149, 154.

drawn from the domestic life of the period—the wooings of young men and maidens, the quarrels of husbands and wives, meetings over pots of ale, common things that happened every day and happened to everybody. The disconsolate lover, the jealous wife, the henpecked husband, the spendthrift and the miser, the drunkard and the beggar, are all drawn from the life and drawn at length. There are pictures of every class of society. Instead of seeking to convey intelligence about events the authors of the ballads attempted to represent life. At the same time the best ballads became more finished in style—more correct in metre and grammar—more varied in their contents and less conventional in their expression. As a literary form the ballad reached its highest perfection, and the two rivals Martin Parker and Laurence Price were the men who perfected it. Parker wrote 'Love will find out the way,' which Palgrave thought worthy of inclusion in the 'Golden Treasury.' We also owe to him the original version of the familiar sea song 'Ye Gentlemen of England,' which appeared in its original shape about 1635, under the title of 'Saylors for my Money.'[1]

These ballads of common life have a value to the historian, although they supply him with no direct information: they reveal to him the most important of all the factors in the political history of the times—the character of the average Englishman. It was on the rude, jovial, materialistic people they describe that a strenuous and enthusiastic minority imposed the rigid yoke of Puritanism; and because it was alien to their nature and repulsive to their habits they threw it off as soon as the dissensions of their conquerors allowed them.

However, there are a few of the ballads of the period which either supply information about economic or social facts, or illustrate changes which were in progress. 'The Coaches' Overthrow,' printed about 1636, celebrates the introduction of sedan chairs in London and predicts the abandonment

[1] *Naval Songs and Ballads*, 1908, pp. 40–46; *Roxburghe Ballads*, vi. 432.

of the hackney coaches, which were regarded as a nuisance in the narrow streets.[1] It was an axiom with English governments that London was too large and also too crowded; they endeavoured to check the extension of the city, and the increase of its population by immigration from the country, by proclamations against new buildings. One of the characteristics of the period was the increasing tendency of the nobility and gentry to spend a very large part of the year in London. On April 8, 1617, King James issued a proclamation ordering all gentlemen and noblemen who had mansions in the country to leave London and reside in them, unless they had special business requiring them to come to London and special leave from the Privy Council.[2] This proclamation was repeated in 1622 and 1623; and on June 20, 1632, a similar one was issued by Charles I, and a gentleman named Palmer was fined £1000 for disobedience.[3]

To this tendency to flock to London there are frequent references in ballads. 'Christmas's Lamentation for the loss of his acquaintance, showing how he is forced to leave the country and come to London' is a good example.

'Christmas is my name, far have I gone,
Without regard,
Whereas great men by flockes there be flown,
To Londonward.
Where they in pomp and pleasure do waste
That which Christmas was wonted to feast;
Welladay!
Houses where music was wont for to ring,
Nothing but bats and howlets do sing;
Welladay!'[4]

Another ballad describes the manor houses standing

[1] *Roxburghe Ballads*, iii. 333. Cf. *Strafford Papers*, ii.

[2] Nichols, *Progresses of James I*, iii. 268, 276; iv. 782, 842. *Court and Times of James I*, i. 353; ii. 358, 383. The King himself is said to have written some verses on the subject. *Ibid.* ii. 364.

[3] Gardiner, *History of England*, vii. 240; Rymer, xix. 374; Rushworth, ii. 144, 288; D'Ewes, *Autobiography*, ii. 78. See also Fanshawe, *Pastor Fido and Other Poems*, 1676, p. 211.

[4] *Roxburghe Ballads*, i. 154.

empty in the country while their masters are in town. It is entitled 'The Map of Mockbeggar Hall, with his situation in the spacious country called Anywhere.'[1]

The contrast between the hospitable habits of the old gentry and the selfish extravagance of the new is the theme of a well-known ballad comparing the old courtier of Queen Elizabeth's days with the King's new courtiers. I take it to have been written about 1630. The old courtier—

'Had an old fashion when Christmas was come,
To call his old neighbours with a bagpipe or a drum,
And good cheer enough to furnish out every old room,
And beer and ale would make a cat speak or a man dumb.'

His successor—

'With a new fashion, when Christmas was drawing on,
On a new journey they must all to London be gone,
And leave none to keep house in the country but their new man John,
Who relieves all his neighbours with a great thump on the back with a cold stone.'[2]

The old courtier, when he died, charged his son to be kind to his tenants. The new one cared nothing about them. Like the Lord of Mockbeggar Hall he exacted great fines from them and raised his rents to maintain his monstrous pride. There is a verse dialogue called 'A Merry and Pleasant Discourse betwixt Simple-Wit the Tenant and Mr. Money-love the Landlord.'[3]

The tenant urges that he has been for twenty years tenant to Mr. Money-love's father, as his forefathers were before him, that he has a large family to maintain, and other moving arguments, 'Oh then, good landlord, do not raise my rent!' He begs in vain. Mr. Money-love replies that

[1] *Roxburghe Ballads*, ii. 132.

[2] 'Old Courtier' (*Roxburghe Ballads*, vi. 756). Mr. Ebsworth says the earliest printed copy is of the date of 1660, but the song is certainly a generation older.

[3] Bodleian Library: *Rawlinson*, 4to, 566 (146).

he wants six horses for his coach, that he means to keep race-horses, go to plays, and wear fine clothes. 'I tell thee, fellow, I thy rent must raise!'

Other ballads repeated the old complaints against greedy farmers who hoard their corn to get higher prices. One is 'A Warning for all Engrossers of Corn: how the Devil met Goodman Inglebred as he was coming from Lynn Market.'[1] Another is 'A Looking Glass for Cornhoarders by the example of John Russell, a farmer dwelling at St. Peter's Chalfont in Buckinghamshire, whose horses sunk into the ground the 4 of March, 1631.'[2]

The best of these economic ballads is one against the draining of the Fens, which is preserved in Dugdale's 'History of Embanking.' The success of any scheme like that for draining the Great Level of the Fens threatened the livelihood of all those who made a living in the swamps and islands of Lincolnshire and Cambridgeshire. These watery wastes were regarded as commons; the fishermen and fowlers who frequented them considered themselves as commoners. Freed from the water the lands would become the private property of the speculators who had provided the money for the drainage works, and corn or grass would be grown where the fowlers had snared geese and wild ducks. The fowlers, therefore, since their interests were most affected by these operations, raised riots, and tried to destroy the banks. The ballad Dugdale prints is a kind of call to arms.[3]

'Come brethren of the water, and let us all assemble,
To treat upon this matter, which makes us quake and tremble,
For we shall rue it, if 't be true that fens be undertaken,
For where we feed in fen and reed they'll feed both beef and bacon.

[1] Bodleian Library: Wood, 401 (161).
[2] *Pepysian Collection*, i. 148.
[3] 'The Powtes Complaint' (Dugdale, *History of Embanking*, p. 391); *cf.* Gardiner, *History of England*, viii. 294.

'Behold the great design, which they do now determine,
Will make our bodies pine, a prey to crows and vermine;
For they do mean all fens to drain and waters overmaster,
All will be dry, and we must die, 'cause Essex calves want pasture.

'The feathered fowls have wings to fly to other nations,
But we have no such things to help our transportations;
We must give place (oh grievous case) to horned beasts and cattle,
Except that we can all agree to drive them out by battle!'

Their leader, they say, shall be 'good old Captain Flood.'

'This noble captain yet was never known to fail us,
But did the conquest get of all that did assail us.'

Legal opposition was organised too, in which Mr. Oliver Cromwell of Ely took a prominent part, and though the drainage scheme was finally carried out, it was considerably altered in the interest of the 'commoners.'[1]

The ballad was probably not printed as a broadside, and was certainly not entered on the Register of the Stationers' Company. For there was a censorship exercised with regard to ballads as there was with regard to all other classes of literature. Instances of their suppression or punishment by the government or the courts of law are not unfrequent. A certain number of these suppressed ballads were satires against particular persons. This was an old practice.

[1] Cromwell's intervention is discussed by Mr. Gardiner in a note (*History of England*, viii. 297), but two pieces of evidence were then unknown to him. They are as follows: 'It was commonly reported,' says a letter, 'by the commoners in Ely Fens and the Fens adjoining, that Mr. Cromwell of Ely had undertaken, they paying him a groat for every cow they had upon the commons, to hold the drainers in suit of law for five years, and that in the mean time they should enjoy every foot of their commons.' *Cal. S. P. Dom.* 1631–2, p. 501. The second is a letter from Sir William Killigrew to Captain Adam Baynes, June 25, 1653: 'I am told that my Lord General Cromwell should say, the draining of the Fens was a good work, but that the drainers had too great a proportion of land for their hazard and charges, and that the poor were not enough provided for, and that the drainers did not pay for the land they had cut through.' *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries*, 1st series, iii. 258.

Falstaff threatened his companions with revenge of this kind when he was displeased with them. 'An I have not ballads made on you all, and sung to filthy tunes, let a cup of sack be my poison.'[1] Such publications were punished by the Star Chamber as libels whenever a complaint was made to it. 'The defendant,' says a Star Chamber case in the second year of Charles the First's reign, 'bearing malice to the plaintiff, did at several times and places, and to several persons in alehouses and elsewhere, publish, divulge, and sing, several libels to the scandal of the plaintiff, and alleged the plaintiff was intended thereby; one of which libels was entitled "A proper song of a great block-head Woollen-draper living in Holborn."' The author was committed to the Fleet and fined 500 marks.[2]

Again in 1632 two respectable Puritans at Rye, Micha Smith and Martha Osmonton, the wife of one of his neighbours, were libelled in a ballad called 'Certain verses made of the purer sort.' Mrs. Osmonton's appearance was carefully described:

'Her face is long, her brows are black,'

and as for Micha Smith:

'So holy he is that he will speake to nobody he meets.'

In this case the defendant was fined 500 marks, and heavy fines were also inflicted on those who had circulated the ballad.[3]

A ballad-monger was also liable to be brought before the High Commission Court if his ballads touched ecclesiastical matters or sacred things. In 1631 Henry Goskin was complained of for printing and composing a ballad 'wherein all the histories of the Bible were scurrilously abused.' It was that entitled 'The Wanton Wife of Bath,' which tells how the lady celebrated by Chaucer died, attempted to find her way to heaven, and defeated by her satirical

[1] *Henry IV*, Act II, Scene ii. 249.
[2] Rushworth, vol. iii., Appendix, p. 6. See also vol. ii. p. 202.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 47; 'Star Chamber Cases' (Camden Society).

tongue the efforts of various patriarchs and apostles to keep her out.[1]

'First Adam came unto the gate, "Who knocketh there?" quoth he.
"I am the wife of Bath," she said, "and fain would come to thee."
"Thou art a sinner," Adam said, "and here no place shalt have."
"Alas for you! good sir," she said, "now gip, you doating knave!
I will come in, in spite," she said, "of all such churls as thee;
Thou art the causer of our woe, our pain and misery.
Thou first broke God's commandment to pleasure thine own wife."
When Adam heard her tell this tale he ran away for life.
Then down came Jacob to the gate, and bids her pack to Hell.
"Thou false Deceiver, why?" quoth she, "thou should'st be there as well;
For thou deceivedst thy father dear and thine own brother too."
Away went Jacob presently, and made no more ado.'

Goskin's defence was 'that the same was printed before he was born, and he hath but renewed it, and is very sorry for it, and that this was never called in.'

The defence was true enough, but did not save Goskin. 'This is not worth the sentence of the court,' said Laud, then Bishop of London, and Goskin was sent to Bridewell. Laud added, 'There was a parish clerk chosen to view all the ballads before they were printed, but he refuseth to do it: let it be ordered that he shall undertake it by commandment from this court.'[2]

Owing no doubt to the activity of the censors, the ballads published during the ten years from 1629 to 1639 afford very

[1] *Roxburghe Ballads*, vii. 213; *Percy's Reliques*, ed. Wheatley, iii. 333. This ballad was long reprinted as a chap-book. I have a copy entitled 'The Wife of Beith revived once more,' with the imprint 'Moscow: Printed for the Cossacks.' It is really an adaptation of the French fabliau 'Du Vilain qui conquist Paradis par plait.'

[2] *Cases in the Courts of Star Chamber and High Commission*, ed. by S. R. Gardiner, p. 314.

few illustrations of the history of the Puritan movement. There were many satirical verses written against the Puritans and some songs, but they were mostly circulated in manuscript. John Rous, a Suffolk clergyman, who preserved some of these for posterity by copying them into his journal, says: 'Many of these rhymes came out in these late times on both sides.'[1] These verse satires were the production of men of letters or poets, and written for the educated classes, not for the multitude. In Richard Corbett's poems, for instance, there is a satire on the hostility of the Puritans to maypoles, in the form of a letter supposed to be written by a 'zealous brother from the Blackfriars' to the minister of Bewdley, 'for the battering down the vanities of the gentiles which are comprehended in a maypole.'[2] John Randolph in his 'eclogue' on Robert Dover's revival of the Cotswold Games inserted verses against the 'melancholy swains' who sought to suppress bagpipes as well as organs.[3] Other satires ridiculed the hostility of the Puritans to painted glass in churches.[4] The dress and demeanour of Puritan preachers, their short hair, ruffs, little caps, nasal twang, trick of turning up the eyes, and other characteristics, all afforded material for scoffers. Cleveland's 'New Teacher of the Town,' an imitation of the ballad on the King's New Courtier, is the best example of these.[5] Puritan women were attacked with equal vigour, and scandals were invented about the 'holy sisters.'[6] Corbett's 'Mad Zealot,' or the 'Distracted Puritan' as it is sometimes called, depicted a

[1] *Diary of John Rous, incumbent of Santon Downham, Suffolk.* Edited by M. A. E. Green, Camden Society, 1856, p. 79.

[2] *Corbett's Poems*, ed. Gilchrist, p. 105. Written probably in the time of James I.

[3] *Randolph's Poems*, ed. W. C. Hazlitt, ii. 622.

[4] Cf. *Corbett's Poems*, ed. Gilchrist, p. 235; *Cleveland's Poems*, ed. 1686, p. 316; *Wit Restored*, p. 186.

[5] *Cleveland's Poems*, ed. 1687, p. 355. (It is here entitled 'The Puritan' and was written, I should say, between 1630 and 1640.)

[6] 'The Way to woo a zealous Lady' (*Rump Songs*, i. 194; *Merry Drollery*, p. 77). See also 'The Ballad of a Puritan,' p. 35 of the supplement of *Loose and Humorous Songs* from *Bishop Percy's Folio MS.*

Puritan preacher, driven mad by the study of prophecy, and committed to Bedlam.

'In the house of pure Emmanuel
I had my education,
Where my friends surmise
I dazzled mine eyes
With the light of Revelation.

'I appeared before the Archbishop,
And all the High Commission;
I gave him no grace,
But told him to his face
That he favoured superstition.

'They bound me like a bedlam,
They lashed my four poor quarters;
Whilst this I endure,
Faith makes me sure
To be one of Foxe's martyrs.

'These injuries I suffer
Through Anti-Christ's persuasion;
Take off this chain,
Neither Rome nor Spain
Can resist my strong invasion.

'Of the Beast's ten horns (God bless us)
I have knockt off three already;
If they let me alone
I'll leave him none:
But they say I am too heady.

'Boldly I preach, hate a cross, hate a surplice,
Mitres, copes, and rochets:
Come hear me pray
Nine times a day,
And fill yourselves with crochets.'[1]

To escape the imposition of ceremonies which they deemed

[1] *Corbett's Poems*, ed. Gilchrist, p. 243; *Percy's Reliques*, ed. Wheatley, ii. 347. I have changed the order of the verses.

superstitious, and to be free of the jurisdiction of the High Commission, were two of the motives which led the Puritans to emigrate. A third was the desire to form congregations consisting solely of men and women of their own way of thinking. Between 1620 and 1640 not less than 20,000 persons settled in New England. Two ballads satirising the emigration and its motives have survived. One is entitled 'A proper new Ballad called "The Summons to New England."'[1]

It described the fertility of New England, its richness in all the fruits of the earth, in turkeys, geese, wild fowl, fish, deer, and all kinds of food. In that country there was complete freedom; no set feasts or fasts to observe, no surplices, no church discipline, no law but the law of nature; and all Puritans were adjured to embark for it.

'Let all the purifidian sect,
I mean the counterfeit elect . . .
Let them sell all, and out of hand
Prepare to go for New England,
To build new Babel strong and sure,
Now called a church unspotted pure.'

The other ballad is called 'The Zealous Puritan,' in the only version we have, which is a later reprint, but its original title probably was 'A friendly Invitation to a new Plantation.' It is an exhortation put into the mouth of a Puritan.

'My brethren all attend,
And list to my relation;
This is the day, mark what I say,
Tends to your renovation;
Stay not amongst the wicked,
Lest that with them you perish,
But let us to New England go
And the pagan people cherish.

[1] *Tanner MS.* 306, p. 286; Ebsworth, *Merry Drollery*, 1661, p. 243.

'Then for the truth's sake come along, come along,
Leave this place of superstition,
Were it not for we that the brethren be,
You would sink into perdition.' [1]

The Puritans were hardly capable of answering their adversaries in kind. They neither wrote ballads nor sang them. Their maxim was 'if a man be merry, let him sing psalms,' and they disapproved of the amorous ditties, romances, and satirical songs loved by the common people. But now and then a Puritan retaliated upon the clergy. The song called 'The New Churchman,' which was written about 1634 or 1635, is an instance. It describes 'the time's new churchman,' with his long coat and cassock, and cardinal's cap.

'With long hair, and a short grace,
Which, being sharp set, he snaps up apace,
And after dinner such a little touch,
His belly is so full he cannot say much.

'His divinity is trussed up with five points,
He dops, ducks, bows, as made all of joints;
But when his Roman nose stands full east
He fears neither God nor beast.

'Some half-dozen of benefices gone down his gullet,
Yet he gapes as though his belly were not full yet;
And sure his curate must be turned away,
If he chance to preach twice a day.' [2]

There is evidence that hostility to the clergy was not confined to Puritan zealots. Worldlings groaned under the disciplinary jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical courts, which imposed fines and penalties upon them for moral

[1] There are four more verses. The only extant version is in *The Rump, or an Exact Collection of the Choicest Poems and Songs relating to the Late Times*, 1662, p. 1. The 'Friendly Invitation' was entered in the *Stationers' Registers* under March 20, 1638–9.

[2] *Diary of John Rous*, p. 78. This appears to be an answer to 'The Town's New Teacher'; and, like it, was apparently suggested by the 'New Courtier of the King.' See also pp. 83, 109.

delinquencies. The apparitor was as unpopular in the days of James I and Charles I as the 'sompnour' was in Chaucer's time. His business was to inform against offenders and bring them before the courts, and often he was merely a blackmailer. 'A New Ballad of the Parator and the Devil' related that, on a certain sabbath day, the Devil rode a-hunting, and met an apparitor hidden behind a bush in a field.

'The Devil desired him courteously,
His whole authority for to tell:
"I am an instrument," quoth he,
"To punish those that live not well . . .
And this is a place that fits me so—
There is none but that I can spy;[1]
Young men with maids a milking go
That think full little I am so nigh.
Although they do no other thing,
But change a glove, or say a ring,
My corum nomine is ready there,
I'll cite them at Lichfield to appear."'

It did not matter whether they were guilty or innocent of the charges he brought: the fees of the ecclesiastical courts must be paid, and the cheapest thing was to bribe the apparitor to suppress the writ.

'The lawyers' fees must needs be paid,
And every clerk in his degree,
Or else the law cannot be stayed
But excommunicate must they be.
For if they come within the curse,
Full largely will it cost their purse,
(My corum nomine telleth me),
How free from sin so ever they be.'

This procedure shocked the Devil's sense of justice.

'"Well," quoth the Devil, "where I do dwell,
The law in sharpness doth exceed;
But yours excell the pains of Hell
To punish men for no misdeed."'

[1] I have altered 'see' to 'spy' and 'courts' to 'curse' for the sake of the rhyme.

The apparitor does not hesitate to blackmail the Devil.

> ' "Why fellow," quoth he, "I can thee stay
> For travelling on the sabbath day;
> My corum nomine doth say so,
> Thou shalt pay fee before thou go."'[1]

On this the Devil replies by carrying the apparitor off to hell, and the ballad ends by warning young men and maidens walking in the fields to be careful, for though this one is gone others quite as bad remain behind.[2]

In 1637 Charles and Laud attempted to impose a Liturgy on Scotland, with the result that three years later the Government collapsed, and Puritans were able to speak their mind about bishops. At first the disturbances in Scotland did not attract much attention in the south, but when the king raised an army ballads for and against the Scots began to be produced. Of those against the Scots about eight are entered in the Stationers' Registers for 1639, of which one perhaps survives.[3] The Government was still strong enough to prevent ballads on the other side from being printed. In April 1640 the King's necessities forced him

[1] *Sherburn Ballads*, p. 306. 'The Devil and the Parator' is enumerated amongst the transfers registered December 14, 1624, and June 1, 1629.

[2] There is another ballad on the ecclesiastical jurisdiction, entitled 'Penance,' in which two sisters set forth their fears 'Lest they do penance in a sheet, and pay their money too.' *Merry Drollery*, ed. Ebsworth, p. 176. For pamphlets and caricatures against the ecclesiastical courts, see the *British Museum Catalogue of Satirical Prints*, pp. 151–156. Cf. *Transactions*, 3rd series, i. 262.

[3] April 25, 1639, 'A willing subject or the soldier's resolution'; May 24, 'The Warr's Cruelty'; May 29, 'Newes from the North'; July 23, 'The Duty of all loyal subjects'; August 6, 'England's rejoicing for the safe return of our royal king'; December 4, 'A true subject's Welcome'; December 4, 'A loyal subject's Wellwishing'; December 11, 'Tom's return from Scotland.' In a small collection of ballads from the collections of Sir James Balfour, printed in 1834, there are a few poems and ballads, mostly printed in Scotland and taking the side of the Scots. They belong to 1640, as a rule, but one of them, entitled 'An English Challenge and Reply from Scotland,' is an English ballad with an answer to every verse added to the original text. The English ballad seems to me to be the 'Soldier's Resolution' mentioned above.

to summon Parliament. Martin Parker published a ballad called ' A brief Description of the Manner how His Majesty and his Nobles went to the Parliament, on Monday the thirteenth day of April, 1640, to the comfortable expectation of all loyal subjects.' Poet and people were full of hope.

> ' We may be assured of this,
> If anything hath been amiss,
> Our king and state will all redress,
> In this good Parliament.' [1]

But the Parliament refused to grant supplies without the redress of grievances, and showed an intention to support the Scots, so, on May 5, it was dissolved. The King raised a new army, and the Scots prepared to enter England. On August 28 the forces of Charles I were defeated at Newburn. Martin Parker, ' the prelates' poet ' as a pamphleteer calls him, wrote many ballads about the war. One was ' A true subject's wish for the happy success of our Royal Army preparing to resist the factious rebellion of those insolent Covenanters.' A second, called ' Britain's Honour,' celebrated the exploits of two valiant Welshmen at Newburn. Some of the King's forces at Newburn made rather a hasty retreat.

> ' Yet blame them not !
> For why ? The Scot
> Was five to one, and came so hot,
> Nothing by staying could be got.'

But these Welshmen — ' two undaunted Trojan worthies '—would not stir out of their trenches till one was killed and the other taken prisoner, after slaying between them five Scots. A third of Parker's ballads, ' Good News from the North,' described a skirmish in which about forty Scots were taken prisoners as they were plundering a

[1] Bodleian Library : Wood, 401 (140).

gentleman's house in Durham.[1] Perhaps these compositions were useful to keep up the spirits of the King's supporters, but when the tide turned Parker 'narrowly escaped jail and a whipping to boot' for his 'base ballads against the Scots.' Englishmen in general regarded the Scots as friends, not enemies. One ballad personified the two countries. It told how 'Jock of broad Scotland went south to complain' against the bishops and other oppressors, and 'Jack of fair England took Jock by the hand,' promising him justice, and Jock pledged himself to stand by Jack with his cudgel in all his quarrels.[2] The refrain of the ballads which Robert Baillie heard when he rode to London in the winter of 1640 was always 'grammercie good Scot.' One of these ballads is called 'A New Carol for Christmas,' and is a rejoicing at the fall of the bishops and the monopolists.

'Where be our proud prelates that straddled so wide,
As if they had meant the moon to bestride;
To tread on the nobles, to trample them down,
To set up the mitre above the king's crown?
That e'er they were clerks our priests have forgot
Which now they'll be taught—grammercie good Scot.'[3]

'Where are the monopolists?' asks another verse, for the Long Parliament began by expelling any members concerned in monopolies. But though there were many satires in verse and prose against patentees and projectors,[4] the bishops were hated still more bitterly.

[1] These three ballads are in Anthony Wood's collection in the Bodleian. Wood, 401, numbers 132, 134, 141. They are reprinted in an article on 'Ballads on the Bishops' Wars,' in the *Scottish Historical Review* for April 1906.

[2] 'A New Carroll,' compiled by a burgess of Perth, is reprinted in the *Scottish Historical Review* for July 1912, p. 363. See, for a sequel, Maidment's *Book of Scottish Pasquils*, p. xvii.

[3] There are two versions in print: *Diary of John Rous*, p. 110; *Ballads from the Collections of Sir James Balfour*, p. 36. Maidment's *Book of Scottish Pasquils*, p. 106, contains another ballad of the same kind.

[4] See the *British Museum Catalogue of Satirical Prints*, i. 192–204.

Their abolition was predicted.

'Since bishops first began to ride
in state so near the crown,
They have been aye puft up with pride,
and rode with great renown;
But God hath pulled these prelates down,
in spite of Spain and Pope,
So shall their next eclipse be soon,
in England seen, I hope.'[1]

Archbishop Laud's impeachment and imprisonment filled Puritans with delight: it was celebrated in 'The Organ's Echo.'

'Memento mori,
I'll tell you a strange story,
Will make you all sorry
For our old friend William;
Alas poor William!

'As he was in his bravery,
And thought to bring us all in slavery,
The Parliament found out his knavery,
And so fell William;
Alas poor William!

'Some say he was in hope
To bring England again to the Pope,
But now he's in danger of an axe or a rope;
Farewell old Canterbury;
Alas poor Canterbury!'[2]

Strafford was often coupled with Laud: the two were the great enemies of the people, brethren in iniquity: one wanted to wear the triple crown of the Pope, the other to be as arbitrary as the sultan.

[1] 'The Bishop's Bridle.' See also 'The Lofty Bishop and the Lazy Brownist' (*Roxburghe Ballads*, vii. 609).

[2] 'The Organ's Echo' (*Roxburghe Ballads*, vii. 612).

'Laudless Will of Lambeth Strand
And black Tom, tyrant of Ireland,
Like fox and wolf did lurk,
With many rooks and magdepies,
To pick out good king Charles his eyes,
And then be Pope and Turk.' [1]

Strafford's fate had in it so many of the elements of tragedy, and he defended himself with such courage and eloquence that even his enemies admired him. There are epitaphs or elegies upon him by three poets, Cleveland,[2] Denham,[3] and Fanshawe.[4] 'Here lies wise and valiant dust' runs Cleveland's verdict. There is also a poem entitled 'Verses written by Thomas Earl of Strafford a little before his Death'—a farewell to the world beginning 'Go empty joys'—but it is evidently by a fourth poet and not by the Earl.[5] Even hostile ballad writers in their droning doggerel showed some touch of pity.

'Draw near, give ear, and hear a peer, whose misery was such,
As envy's hate, a great man's fate, relentlessly did touch.
Once I was near the prince's ear, and dear unto the state,
But now my bliss reduced is to this sad tragic fate. . . .
Relent hard heart what e'er thou art, when thou shalt see my fall,
What happened me, may fall to thee, do justice then to all.' [6]

After Strafford's execution (May 12, 1641) the attack on the bishops and the Church redoubled in vigour and bitterness. In December 1641 twelve bishops, prevented by

[1] A ballad called 'Will and Tom' amongst the *Domestic State Papers of Charles I*, vol. 487, No. 48. Other satirical compositions are noticed in the *British Museum Catalogue of Satirical Prints*, i. 139, 147, 149.

[2] Cleveland's *Poems*, p. 184, ed. 1687, on the Earl of Strafford's trial.

[3] Denham's *Poems*, p. 65, ed. 1671.

[4] Fanshawe's *Pastor Fido with the addition of divers other poems*, 1676, p. 302 and perhaps p. 266.

[5] *Ballads from the Collections of Sir James Balfour*, p. 40.

[6] 'The Lieutenant's Lacrimæ' (*Somers Tracts*, iv. 284–7).

mob violence from attending the House of Lords, drew up an ill-judged protest declaring that its proceedings in its absence were null and void, and that it was no free parliament. For this all twelve were sent to join Laud in the Tower. In 'The Bishops' last Good Night' a ballad-maker gave utterance to the exultation of the Puritan mob.

'Come down, Prelates, all a-row,
Your Protestation brings you low,
Have we not always told you so?
You are too saucy, Prelates,
Come down, Prelates.'[1]

With bishops it was hoped all other relics of superstition and superfluous pomps and ceremonies would vanish. Organs and choristers would go.

'We may now abjure our singing,
For ceremonies bringing
Into the Church, and ringing,
For the downfall of the organs;
Alas poor organs.'[2]

Choristers, it was said, might go and hang themselves, and the young scholars of the two universities, who had hoped to get good benefices as the reward of their learning, found gifted mechanics preferred before them. As one scholar complained:

'All the arts I have skill in
Divine and humane,
Yet all's not worth a shilling;
When the women hear me they do but jeer me,
And say I am profane:
Once I remember, I preached with a weaver,
I quoted Austin, he quoted Dod and Cleaver;
I nothing got. He got a cloak and beaver:
Alas, poor scholar! whither wilt thou go?'[3]

[1] 'The Bishops' Last Good Night,' cf. *Catalogue of Satirical Prints*, i. 166.
[2] 'The Organ's Funeral' (*Roxburghe Ballads*, vii. 614).
[3] 'Alas, Poor Scholar,' by Dr. Robert Wild (*Roxburghe Ballads*, vi. 456). See also *Diary of John Rous*, p. 115.

He decided that all he could do was to turn schoolmaster in some country place.

Naturally there were verses written in defence of the Church and against the Puritans, but from 1640 to 1642 what was printed and published in the form of ballads and songs was nearly all on one side. Royalist songs produced during this period were many of them not printed till later, and many are still in manuscript. The Long Parliament seems to have retained its popularity throughout 1641. 'Good News for all true-hearted subjects: videlicet the Parliament still sits' is the title of a ballad published about May in that year.[1] 'Thanks to the Parliament' is the title of another, published in 1642, but when the second was written Parliament had need of defending from its critics.

'See how this wise assembly they abuse,
And fill our heads with tittle tattle news,
As if they were far worse than Turks or Jews,
Because they are the men whom we did choose,
For the great Council of the King,
And the King's great Council.'

Whatever others may do, the author resolved to stick to the Parliament against all opponents.

'They go in fear of poison and of knives,
Are slaves themselves to free our feet from gyves,
Neglect their own to save us and our wives;
I'll lose them all had I a thousand lives,
For the great Council of the King,
And the King's great Council.'[2]

The reaction against the Long Parliament began, it is usually said, when the King came back from Scotland and was welcomed and entertained by the City on November 25, 1641, with an enthusiasm which proved that the tide had turned. A 'stately cavalcade' of citizens rode out to meet

[1] *Thomason Tracts*, 669, p. 4 (22).
[2] *Luttrell Collection*, vol. ii. 221.

Charles. A satirical poet describes the Lord Mayor himself 'on cock horse' at the head of the procession: next

'Two dozen aldermen rode two by two,
Their gowns were all scarlet, but their noses were blue . . .
The citizens rode in their golden chains,
Some held by their pummels and some by their manes.'[1]

The King's attempt to arrest the Five Members gave a shock to the reviving loyalty of London, but its results were only temporary.[2] As the Civil War drew nearer, the party which wished to maintain the Church was reinforced by all the timid and cautious, and satirical verses against the Parliament multiplied. For instance there is 'The Parliament's Hymn,'[3] which begins by praising the Triennial Act.

'O Lord preserve the Parliament
And send them long to reign,
From three years' end to three years' end,
And so to three again.

'Let neither King nor Bishops, Lord,
Whilst they shall be alive,
Have power to rebuke thy saints,
Nor hurt the Members Five.

'For they be good and godly men,
No sinful path they tread,
They now are putting Bishop down
And setting up Roundhead.'

The most prominent of the Five Members was Pym, and he was consequently the special mark for loyal satirists—'King Pym' they called him.

'Reader behold the counterfeit of him
Who now controls the land, almighty Pym,'

[1] 'Upon the King's Return to London' (Dryden's *Miscellany Poems*, vi. 383, ed. 1716). See Gardiner's *History of England*, x. 84–5.
[2] 'The Five Members' Thanks to the Parliament' (*Rump Songs*, i. 58).
[3] *Rump Songs*, i. 64.

begin some lines upon Pym's picture, and end by saying :

> 'The picture's like him, yet 'tis very fit
> To add one likeness more, that's hang like it.'[1]

One ingenious ballad purports to be the dying speech of a Devonshire gentleman who was executed for high treason ; it was evidently meant for a prophetic version of Pym's last remarks. He owns his sins, confesses to treason, corruption, extortion, and other iniquities, and makes a penitent ending.

> 'O Tyburn, Tyburn, O thou sad Triangle,
> A viler weight on thee ne'er yet did dangle,
> See here I am at last, with hemp so new,
> To give thee what was long before thy due.
>
> 'How could I bless thee, couldst thou take away
> My life and infamy both in one day ;
> But this in ballads will survive I know,
> Sung to that preaching tune, *Fortune my Foe.*
>
> 'Then mark, good Christian people and take heed,
> Use not religion for an upper weed,
> Serve God sincerely, touch not his Anointed,
> And then your necks shall never be disjointed.'[2]

In the summer of 1642 the Civil War began.[3] The Parliament raised its army largely by subscriptions, promising eight per cent. interest for the money lent. Contributions in kind such as horses, arms, and plate, were registered and taken in lieu of money. Some royalist wrote a satirical song urging the zealous citizens to bring in their silver to the Committee at the Guildhall.

[1] *Rump Songs*, i. 7 ; see also pp. 3, 18, 21, 32, 33, 37, 49, 50, 68, 79, 93, 95, 131.

[2] 'The Penitent Traitor.' There are two versions of this ballad ; one is given in *Rump Songs*, i. 53 ; the other is in Wright's *Political Ballads*, p. 30, and though apparently not printed till 1647, was evidently written in 1642 or 1643.

[3] *Cf.* 'The Old Earl of Bristol's verses on an Accommodation' (*Rump Songs*, p. 63) ; *Diary of John Rous*, i. 124.

'Your basins large and ewers,
Unto this use allot them,
If ever you mean your hands to clean
From the sins by which you got them.

'Let the religious sempstress
Her silver thimble bring here,
'Twill be a fine thing in deposing a king
To say you had a finger.

'Your child's redeemed whistle
May here obtain admittance,
Nor shall that cost be utterly lost,
They'll give you an acquittance.'[1]

The constitutional fictions by which the Parliament covered its warlike proceedings with a show of legality were another good subject for the satirists. It used the King's name, and its soldiers nominally fought for King and Parliament.

''Tis to preserve his Majesty
That we against him fight,
Nor ever are we beaten back,
Because our cause is right.
If any make a scruple at
Our declarations, say
Who fight for us fight for the king
The clean contrary way.'[2]

Of course there were exhortations in verse on the other side.[3] There is 'A spiritual Song of Comfort or Encouragement to the soldiers that are now gone forth in the cause of Christ.'

[1] *Rump Songs*, i. 88.

[2] 'Colonel Venne's Encouragement to his Soldiers' (*Rump Songs*, i. 149; Alexander Brome's *Poems*, p. 162).

[3] For instance, 'An Encouragement to Warre or Bellum Parliamentare,' by John Ward.

'What though the walls of Jericho
Be strong and broad and tall and high,
'Tis faith, though with the sound of rams-horns,
Upon the ground shall make them lie.'[1]

Perhaps it was because the poets were all on the King's side that the Puritan armies sang psalms rather than war-songs—certainly Puritan attempts to supply their place by compositions written for the purpose were all failures.[2] On the other hand; though we are told more than once that the Cavaliers charged singing, we do not know what they sang.

Strangely enough there are very few ballads about the incidents of the war; there are none of the long verse narratives which had been habitually issued about famous battles in France and Germany. All we have about the battles and sieges which took place in England are a few satirical songs or ballads. First of all there is 'The Banbury Song' which tells the story of the capture by Colonel Lunsford and the Cavaliers of certain guns (sent from London to Warwick Castle), which were very tamely surrendered by Colonel Fiennes and the Roundheads of Banbury.[3] There is next a doggerel ballad on the defeat of the Roundheads at Powick Bridge near Worcester by Prince Rupert on September 23, 1642.[4] There are two songs by Denham on the war in the west of England—'A Western Wonder' and 'A Second Western Wonder,' the first celebrating the battle of Stratton, the second those of Lansdown and Roundway.[5] There are two little ballads setting forth the feelings of the garrisons of Newark[6] and Hereford and

[1] By William Starbuck: *British Museum*, 669, f. 8 (47).

[2] Professor Henry Morley reprints in *The King and the Commons*, 1868, two specimens of Wither's which are better than the rest.

[3] *Bishop Percy's Folio MS.*, ed. Hales and Furnivall, ii. 39; *Oxford Drollery*, p. 121.

[4] *Rump Songs*, i. 153. See Gardiner's *Great Civil War*, i. 30.

[5] *Rump Songs*, pp. 134, 152; see Gardiner, i. 136, 169; Denham's *Poems*, pp. 105, 107.

[6] See 'Newark' in *Bishop Percy's Folio MS.* ii. 33, and for the 'Song on the Siege of Hereford,' *Ashmolean MS.* xxxvi. 226. Part of the latter is printed in the article on 'Ballads illustrating the Relations of England and Scotland during the seventeenth century,' published in the *Scottish Historical Review* for January 1909 (p. 117).

their scorn for their besiegers. The valiant commander, 'with his resolute Lady,' tells how a royalist officer in Chester, fearing its capture, wished his wife were safe in Shrewsbury, but the lady resolved to fight by his side.

'Put me on man's attire, give me a soldier's coat,
I'll make King Charles's foes quickly to change their note.
Cock your match, prime your pan, let piercing bullets fly,
I do not care a pin whether I live or die.'[1]

Last in the series comes 'Prince Rupert and Prince Maurice, their Farewell to England.'[2] This is a dialogue between the two in which the younger brother reproaches Rupert with the taste for plundering which had earned him the hatred of the people, and had more than once caused the loss of a battle. 'Our army at Edgehill was a rare sight,' says Rupert. 'Yes,' says Maurice,

'We like St. Georges had killed all the dragons,
But thou wast too eager to plunder their waggons.'

'I banged them at Newbury,' says Rupert. 'Yes,' says Maurice, 'there was "handsome knocking" at Newbury, but they got the best of it, and you were routed at Naseby. Though we got the better of them at first, in the end we were worsted.'

'For now we are forced to bid England adieu.'

The last five words are the refrain of each verse.

Throughout the whole war, from 1642 to 1646, there were frequent negotiations between the King and the Parliament; in each camp there was a peace party and a war party. The most important of the early negotiations was the treaty which took place at Oxford in March 1643. Amongst the Parliamentary leaders Hampden was conspicuous for his conviction that the quarrel must be fought out before it would be possible to come to terms with Charles I. Sir John Denham wrote a ballad professing to represent Hampden's speech to the Committee of Safety in favour of the vigorous prosecution of the war. Another wit wrote an

[1] *Roxburghe Ballads*, vi. 281.
[2] *Roxburghe Ballads*, viii.; preface, p. xxiii.***

imaginary account of a debate in the House of Commons in which thirty members gave their reasons against peace. A parliamentarian answered it by another, in which the leaders of the King's party explained that they, too, in order to avoid the consequences of their crimes, were opposed to any agreement.[1]

Religious far more than political differences prevented any compromise. After abolishing episcopacy Parliament proceeded to try and to condemn to death Archbishop Laud. There are many lamenting elegies on his death,[2] and one savagely exultant ballad anticipating his execution—'You must preach,' it tells him, 'in the pulpit that stands on Tower Hill, you filled Church and state with strife.'

'Like a bless'd martyr you will die
For church's good; she rises high
When such as you fall down.'[3]

In their hatred of all that seemed to savour of popery or superstition, the Puritans destroyed monuments and stained-glass windows, and waged a bitter war against crosses, whether in churches or outside them. In 1643 Cheapside and Charing Crosses[4] were pulled down and the remains carted away. The removal of these landmarks had its disadvantages, says a ballad on Charing Cross.

'Undone, undone the lawyers are,
They wander about the town,
Nor can find the way to Westminster
Now Charing Cross is down.'[5]

[1] 'Mr. Hampden's Speech against Peace at the Close Committee' (*Rump Songs*, p. 9); 'The sense of the House' (*ibid.* p. 9); 'The Sence of the Oxford Junto' (*British Museum*, 669, f. 6, numbers 117, 122, and 669, f. 10 (20)).

[2] See *Rump Songs*, i. 71.

[3] 'A Prognostication on Will Laud, late Archbishop of Canterbury' (Wilkins, *Political Ballads*, i. 13). See also *Catalogue of Satirical Prints*, pp. 288–301.

[4] 'The Downfall of Cheapside Cross'; 'A Vindication of Cheapside Cross against the Roundheads' (*Rump Songs*, i. pp. 138, 140). See also *Catalogue of Satirical Prints*, i. 221, 262.

[5] *Percy's Reliques*, ed. Wheatley, ii. 323.

A few weeks before the Solemn League and Covenant was made with the Scots, Parliament had entrusted the reformation of the Church to an assembly of divines. It met in July 1643, and consisted originally of about 150 persons, of whom 120 were divines, twenty M.P.'s, and ten members of the House of Lords. To these were added, in 1644, four Scottish divines and about as many Scottish laymen. The Assembly drew up a new service book called the Directory to replace the Book of Common Prayer, a new Catechism, and a scheme for the organisation of the English Church on a Presbyterian basis. Parliament, after amending the proposals of the Assembly to its own satisfaction, passed ordinances imposing them upon England.

Vainly the Independents struggled, in the Assembly itself and outside it, for toleration for their tenets, the right to preach what they believed, and the power to form congregations of their adherents. The Assembly, backed by the City of London and the Scots, was determined to put down heresy as well as episcopacy. The soldiers of the New Model Army complained that they were denied the liberty they had fought for, and by the mouth of Cromwell demanded freedom of conscience. Independents and Episcopalians and free-thinkers all united to attack the Assembly. Satires in prose and verse were directed against its members and its proceedings, especially during the years 1645, 1646, and 1647. Cleveland, Denham, Cowley, and Butler were the protagonists in this literary war. Cleveland was particularly prolific and abusive. 'Avaunt, prodigious mountebanks' begins one of his satires; 'Flea-bitten synod' begins another.[1]

The divines were very sensitive to the attacks made

[1] 'Westminster College; or, England's Complaint against those that sit in the chamber called Jerusalem' (*British Museum*, 669, f. 11 (88)); 'The Mixt Assembly'; 'The Hue and Cry after Sir John Presbyter' (*Rump Songs*, i. 192; Cleveland's *Poems*, pp. 30, 32); 'The Ghost of Sir John Presbyter' (*Catalogue of Satirical Prints*, i. 383, 389); 'The Assembly Man' (*Somers Tracts*, v. 487); 'The Four-legged Elder' (*Rump Songs*, i. 350).

upon them, especially to those which came from the Independents.

'The Sectarians,' complained Thomas Edwards, 'have carried themselves towards the Assembly with the greatest scorn and reproach that ever any sort of men carried themselves towards such a company of ministers learned and godly and called by Parliament to advise with in matters of religion. Oh, how many books have been written against them within the two last years or thereabouts, as "The Arraignment of Mr. Persecution," "Martin's Echo," and their fellows. Oh the railing, bitter, disgraceful passages in "Lilburn's Letter to Mr. Prynne," "Tender Conscience religiously affected," and divers other pamphlets against the Assembly, calling them the black-coats in the synod, dry-vines good for nothing to be burnt, having two horns like a lamb but a mouth like a dragon, teaching the Parliament to speak blasphemy against those saints that dwell in Heaven. Oh how commonly by word of mouth and in writing is the Assembly called Antichristian, Romish, bloody, the plagues and pests of the kingdom, Baal's priests, diviners, soothsayers, all manner of evil being spoken of them. A ballad hath been made of them having a first and second part, wherein they are scoffed with the title of Black-bird Divines: the name of the ballad is "A Prophecy of the Swineherd's Destruction," to the tune of "The Merry Soldier or the Jovial Tinker." This ballad calls the Assembly swineherds, and saith these swineherds are sitting to build old Babel's Tower.'[1]

Unluckily this ballad is lost. One which has survived takes a different line; the divines, it says, had sat for four years to find out a new religion, but without success, and they would go on sitting as long as their salaries continued.

'The synod who dare to control?
They sit in Sion House.
The people looked for mountains, but
They have brought forth a mouse.'

[1] Edwards, *Gangraena*, pt. iii. p. 230, 1646.

'What religion are we to have in England?' it goes on to ask. 'Are we to be Brownists, or Presbyterians, or Antinomians, or Adamites and wear no clothes? Give us some religion, old or new, and we shall be obliged to you.'

'And now farewell, O synod brave!
It is in vain to think
We a religion e'er shall have,
While that your pockets chink.
Four shillings every day, besides
Your greasy benefices,
Makes you to have enlarged sides,
But pulls the truth in pieces.'[1]

The Parliament's allies, the Scots—detested by the English Royalists as rebels—were now hated by the English Independents as the authors of the Presbyterian tyranny, which Parliament and the Synod were attempting to establish. The inhabitants of the northern counties complained loudly that they had been plundered by the Scottish soldiers called in to help them against the Royalists. When the Scots left England at the close of 1646, and handed over the king to the Parliament's commissioners, in exchange for their arrears of pay, they were stigmatised by the Royalists as a race of Judases.[2]

In the spring of 1647 a quarrel broke out between the Parliament and the army because the Parliament wished to disband the army without paying its arrears. Little sympathy was felt for the soldiers,[3] but there was great joy

[1] 'A Justification of the Synod of Sion College' (Wright's *Political Ballads*, p. 76).

[2] See Cleveland's 'Rebel Scot' and 'The Scot's Apostacy' (*Poems*, pp. 37, 182, 340); 'The Committee-man's Complaint' (Wright, *Political Ballads*, p. 60); 'The Scot's Arrears' (*Rump Songs*, i. 222); 'A Justification of our Brethren of Scotland' (*British Museum*, 669, f. 11 (77)); 'Judas justified' (*ibid.* 669, f. 11 (103)).

[3] There are a certain number of poems and ballads on the soldiers. See the 'Mercenary Soldier' (April 1646: *British Museum*, 669, f. 10 (49)); 'The Zealous Soldier' (*ibid.* 669, f. 10 (50)); 'The Soldier's Sad Complaint' (July 1647: *ibid.* 669, f. 11 (48)); 'Ireland's Complaint of the Army's Hypocrisy' (September 1647: *ibid.* 669, f. 11 (85)).

amongst the Royalists to see their enemies falling out, and great exultation when the army marched on London. Take for an example 'The Parliament's Knell.'

'Farewell old Parliament of seven years' standing,
Now make your testament; there's no disbanding;
That very rebel rout, your first upholders,
Are come to pull you out by head and shoulders.

'King Charles is loose at last, the Scots have sold him,
And when you had him fast, you could not hold him,
He is now on his way, he'll no more sue to ye,
Fairfax hath played fair play and done his duty.

'Your proud Presbytery cannot protect you,
Your wise Directory cannot direct you,
We shall have bishops' stoles with copes and mitres,
Buff coats shall preach no more, nor priests be fighters.'[1]

Other ballad-writers predicted a political as well as an ecclesiastical revolution. The city was to be plundered; the mayor led up and down with his gold chain round his neck; the aldermen to be treated with indignities which my pen refuses to transcribe. All the pent-up hatred of the Royalists against London for its support of the Parliamentary cause found vent in verse.[2] Nor were the members of Parliament to escape justice; they were to be hung up at Tyburn like beads on a string, amid general rejoicings.

'Not a bell shall be heard that tolls, tolls,
Not a saint sing one pitiful rhyme,
Nor a sister shall pray for their poor souls,
As up to the gallows they climb.'

All these things were to happen when Cromwell and Fairfax captured London, or as a ballad put it, 'when Ironsides to London rides, and with his nose shall set the town

[1] Wood, 416, No. 7.
[2] See, for instance, *Rump Songs*, i. 114.

on fire.'[1] But none of these bloody prognostications were fulfilled. When the army marched on London the citizens and apprentices did not show fight. Southwark opened its gates to the army as soon as it drew near, and Fairfax's regiments entered London in August 1647 without striking a blow. The government of London was put into the hands of the Independents, the Tower was garrisoned by the army, and the Presbyterian leaders were expelled from Parliament. The tame submission of the city was ridiculed in a dozen ballads.

'Brave citizens you have done well,
To make your slaves your masters,
Your policy it doth excel—
Your grooms will be your tasters.
My Lord Mayor and the Aldermen,
Your gowns must make them breeches;
And if you do retort again
They'll make you eat your speeches.

'O brave Common-Council men!
O brave trained bands!
When do you think to get again
The staff into your own hands?'[2]

Another ballad said:

'London is a fine town,
Yet I their cases pity,
Their Mayor and some few aldermen
Have quite undone the City.'[3]

One thing the army did was to order the destruction

[1] Bodleian Library; *MS. Rawlinson Poet.* 246, p. 30*b*.

[2] 'A la Mode: the City's profound policy in delivering themselves, etc.' See also 'The City's Thanks to Southwark,' 'The Braggadocia Soldier and the Civil Citizen' (Wright, *Political Ballads*, pp. 64, 70, 85); 'The City's Welcome to Colonel Rich and Colonel Baxter' (*British Museum*, 669, f. 11 122)); 'The City Asse'; 'Troynovant must not be Burnt' (669, f. 12 (21)).

[3] 'The City's Loyalty to the King' (Wright, *Political Ballads*, p. 42).

of the entrenchments raised for the defence of the City in 1643—'the lines' as they were called. A poet wrote:

'Is this the end of all the toil
And labour of the Town,
And did our bulwarks rise so high
Thus low to tumble down?

'The popish doctrine shall no more
Prevail within our nation,
For now we see that by our works
There's no justification.'[1]

The triumph of the army was shortlived. They might purge the Parliament and subdue the City; they could not succeed in achieving the settlement of the kingdom. By the threat of force they obliged the Parliament to draw up terms of which they approved, and to offer them to the King, but they could neither persuade nor force Charles to accept them. The soldiers justly thought that it was unsafe to restore the King to his powers except upon stringent conditions. The majority of the nation felt only that unless the King was restored to his powers a peaceful settlement was impossible. That was the moral of the popular ballad 'When the King enjoys his own again,' written about 1643 by Martin Parker, and often reprinted with additional verses.

'All things will be well when the King enjoys his own again,'

says the first verse. 'The Times will not mend till the King enjoys his own again' and 'The wars will not cease till the King enjoys his own again,' add others.[2]

Every year's fighting strengthened this belief, and the confusion which followed the close of the war made it general.

[1] *Rump Songs*, i. p. 245; Alexander Brome's *Poems*, p. 145. Compare 'Black Tom's Speech' (*British Museum*, 669, f. 11 (84)).

[2] Wilkins, *Political Ballads*, vol. i. p. 10; *Roxburghe Ballads*, vii. 633, 682.

The change in the position of the King was remarkable. When he was at the head of an army he had possessed the passionate loyalty of a part of his people; when he was a prisoner he began to attract a pity and a sympathy due rather to his sufferings than his acts. Poets hitherto had celebrated the romantic incidents in his life: the Spanish journey—the meeting with the Queen on the field of Edgehill—the escape in disguise from Oxford—and so on.[1] They now began to idealise his character; to represent him as the patient and forgiving father of a wayward and factious people, and to endow him with all the qualifications for saintship and martyrdom. He was represented as fighting for the rights of the people, not merely for his own, and he certainly was the champion of principles dear to a large part of them. Hence they applauded his refusal to accept the terms offered him by Parliament. One poet said:

'Hold out brave Charles, and thou shalt win the field,
Thou canst not lose thyself unless thou yield
On such conditions as will force thy hand
To give away thy sceptre, crown, and land,
And what is worse, to hazard by thy fall,
To lose a greater crown more worth than all.'[2]

His sale by the Scots had suggested the betrayal of Christ by Judas, and this parallel was developed at length both in prose and verse. Dr. Gardiner quotes an imitation of George Herbert's 'Sacrifice,' published in June 1647, in which the King complains that he has been bought and sold. The army, whose captive he now is, will sell him as the Scots did, or kill him, but it is not for his own sake that he sorrows.

[1] 'Upon the Meeting of the King and Queen upon Edgehill' (*Ashmole MS.* 36); 'The King's Disguise (*Rump Songs*, i. p. 211; Cleveland's *Poems*, p. 46); 'A Satire Occasioned by the Author's Survey of a Scandalous Pamphlet entitled, "The King's Cabinet Opened"' (*Rump Songs*, i. p. 169).

[2] 'Upon His Majesty's Coming to Holmby' (Wilkins, *Political Ballads*, i. 38).

'For my wronged kingdom's sake, my very grief
Doth break my heart. Until I find relief
I'll sue to heaven mercy from God, my chief:
Never was grief like mine.'[1]

The last words are the refrain of every verse. Of all the poems attributed to the King himself the most famous is that entitled 'Majesty in Misery: a copy of verses written by his Majesty in his captivity,' which, according to Burnet, 'a very worthy gentleman, who had the honour of waiting on him then, and was much trusted by him,' were copied out from the original.[2]

It begins by asserting the divine right of monarchy; Charles appeals to the King of Kings, as the founder of monarchy, to protect his rights.

'Nature and law by the divine decree
(The only root of righteous royalty),
With this dim diadem invested me. . . .'

Yet his own servants and favourites have forsaken him.

'The fiercest furies that do daily tread
Upon my grief, my grey discrowned head,
Are those that owe my bounty for their bread.'

Loyalty and faithfulness to the Church are punished as if they were crimes.

'Churchmen are chained and schismatics are freed,
Mechanics preach, and holy fathers bleed,
The crown is crucified with the creed.'

Presbyter and Independent agree against true religion as Pontius Pilate and Herod did against Christ. They promise the King great things if he will yield to their demands, and threaten his life because he refuses.

[1] Gardiner, *History of England*, iii. 310.
[2] Burnet, *Lives of the Hamiltons*, p. 483, ed. 1852.

'Felons obtain more privilege than I,
They are allowed to answer ere they die,
'Tis death for me to ask the reason why.'[1]

But, instead of asking God to avenge his wrongs, he prays Him to have mercy on these misguided men, to forgive them because they know not what they do. Since they despise God's edicts about his worship, how can they respect the power of his Anointed?

Many Englishmen supported the King, not because they loved Charles but because the maintenance of monarchy seemed to them the only thing that could save England from chaos. Conflicting sects and warring factions could never agree; to restore the King was the only way.

This is set forth in a ballad, published in 1648, called 'The Anarchy.' It describes a sort of mass meeting to settle the future religion and government of England. A member of Parliament addresses it:

'Now that, thanks to the powers below,
We have e'en done out our do,
The mitre is down,
And so is the crown,
And with them the coronet too;
Come clowns, and come boys,
Come hobber-de hoys,
Come females of each degree,
Stretch your throats, bring in your votes,
And make good the anarchy.
And "thus it shall go," says Alice;
"Nay, thus it shall go," says Amy;
"Nay, thus it shall go," says Taffy, "I trow,"
"Nay, thus it shall go," says Jamy.'

'Ah, good people,' says the speaker, 'the truth is a difficult thing to discover; you must decide what the

[1] According to Burnet these lines were written when the King was at Carisbrooke Castle, but from the allusion to his trial they must have been written later. A broadside copy is in the *Roxburghe Ballads* (vi. 619), but undated.

truth is and which of your sects has it.' Again the answer is discordant.

'"Sure, I have the truth," says Numph;
"Nay, I have the truth," says Clem;
"Nay, I have the truth," says reverend Ruth,
"Nay, I have the truth," says Em.'

'Well,' says the speaker, 'let the truth be where it will, these divisions in religion reduce our power; take one religion and stick to it, here are forty to choose from.'

'"Take your choice, the major voice
Shall carry it right or wrong."

'"Then we'll be of this," says Meg;
"Nay, we'll be of that," says Tib;
"Come, we'll be of all," says pitiful Paul,
"Nay, we'll be of none," says Gib.'

'After all,' replies the speaker, 'religion does not really matter, the question of government is really the important one.'

'As for religion, to speak right,
And in the House's sense,
The matter's all one to have any or none,
If it were not for the pretence;
But herein doth lurk the key of the work,
Even to dispose of the crown,
Dexterously, and as may be
For your behoof and our own.

'"Then let's have King Charles," says George,
"Nay, let's have his son," says Hugh,
"Nay, let us have none," says jabbering Joan,
"Nay, let's all be kings," says Prue.'

Despairing of arriving at any agreement, since even when the populace is victorious it can do nothing but debate, the speaker appeals to the Royalists.

'Come royalists then do you play the men,
And cavaliers give the word,
Now let us see at what you would be,
And whether *you* can accord.

'"A health to King Charles," says Tom,
"Up with it," says Ralph like a man,
"God bless him," says Doll, "and raise him," says Moll,
"And send him his own," says Nan.'[1]

This was the feeling which produced the premature attempt to restore the monarchy known as the Second Civil War. The second war lasted less than six months, for the army was too well led and too well organised for their opponents to keep the field long, and sieges fill a large part of the story. There are ballads on the defeat of the Scots at Preston[2] and the siege of Colchester,[3] but they are not worth quoting. The ballads on the King's execution are poor too. It is strange that an event which moved England so deeply, and was so long remembered, should not have inspired ballads more worthy of the subject. About half a dozen survive, and several of those are of much later date.

'Fair England's joy is fled, welladay, welladay,
Our noble King is dead, sweet prince of love.
This heavy news so bad, hath made three kingdoms sad,
No comfort to be had but from above.

'On Tuesday last his grace, cheerfully, cheerfully,
Went to his dying place, to end all strife,
With many a weeping eye, with groans unto the sky,
To see his Majesty there end his life.

'His foes he did forgive, graciously, graciously,
And wisht we all might live in quiet peace;
He wisht whate'er was past that he might be the last,
No sorrow we might taste, but wars might cease.'[4]

[1] 'The Anarchie; or, the blest Reformation since 1640.' There are two editions, one dated January 11, 1648, the other October 24, 1648. It is reprinted in Wright's *Political Ballads*, p. 112, in Wilkins's *Political Ballads*, i. p. 32; and in *Rump Songs*, i. 291.

[2] 'The Piteous Moans of the Prisoners lately taken at Colchester' (*British Museum*, E. 470 (9)); 'A letter from Colchester relating their Diet' (*MS. Rawlinson Poet.* xxvi. p. 21).

[3] *Rump Songs*, i. 248.

[4] See *Roxburghe Ballads*, vol. vii. Preface, p. xc***. This ballad so far as it goes does attempt to summarise what the King said. There is in the same series, vii. 626, another ballad called 'The King's Last Speech,' which begins 'I come, my blessed Saviour.' It is a poor composition, in no way reproducing the King's real words.

The best and probably the earliest is 'King Charles his Speech and last Farewell to the World,' of which only seven stanzas survive.

There are also two narrative ballads: 'The Manner of the King's Trial'[1] and 'England's Black Tribunal.' The first of them was clearly written immediately after the trial itself, and gives a fairly accurate account both of trial and execution. 'England's Black Tribunal' is later. It is addressed to 'true Churchmen all,' bids them remember how the best of kings was murdered by the cruel Presbyterians, and exhorts men to remember his fate and never put it in the power of the Nonconformists to overthrow the Church again. Most likely it was written in the reign of Queen Anne, but there is no precise evidence of its date. One interesting point is that it reproduces with tolerable exactness the King's conversation with the Princess Elizabeth and the Duke of Gloucester.[2]

Whenever, during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the struggle between the Church and the Nonconformists rose high, the murder of the King was adduced as an argument against any relaxation of the laws against Nonconformity, or any extension of their political rights. It was long remembered in other countries too. There is a curious ballad, called 'The success of the two English Travellers,' printed about April 1685, describing how two Englishmen travelled through Europe for some twenty years and wherever they went, in France, Spain, or Italy, were rebuked by foreigners for the crime their nation had committed.

> 'When we was a walking along in the street,
> Both men, wives and children and all we did meet,
> They gathered up stones and at us did fling,
> Crying "Rebels of England, you murdered your king."'[3]

[1] 'The Manner of the King's Trial' (*Roxburghe Ballads*, vii. 622). It begins, 'King Charles was once a King of great state.'

[2] 'England's Black Tribunal; or, King Charles' Martyrdom' (*Douce Ballads*, iii. 25. Bodleian Library). There is also a ballad called 'Tyrant's Triumphant; or, the High Court of State,' which is to be found only in the Chetham Library. It consists of a list of the King's judges and characters of them.

[3] *Roxburghe Ballads*, v. 543.

SOME ASPECTS OF CASTLEREAGH'S FOREIGN POLICY

By C. K. WEBSTER, M.A., F.R.Hist.S.

Read November 16, 1912

But little is yet known of the vast mass of documents bearing upon nineteenth-century history which are to be found in the archives of Europe; and historians have been tempted to take refuge in the thought that, after all, these papers contain little that is really of great value. How far that is true for any period of the nineteenth century may, I think, be doubted; but for the period during which Castlereagh held office, it can, surely, be urged that the unpublished documents in the Record Office are of real importance. Singularly, little attention has been paid by English historians to this period of history, and but little use has as yet been made of unpublished material. It is true that the collections of papers in the Londonderry correspondence and the Wellington Supplementary Dispatches contain a vast amount of information; but, valuable as this is, it is only a small fragment of the whole, and much of it can only be interpreted by the aid of other evidence. What has already been done in this way has thrown much new light on the character and achievements of Castlereagh. Fyffe was able to appreciate his career and his connexion with the congress system with much more justice, because he had seen some of the documents of the years 1814–15; and Mr. Alison Phillipps' monographs in the 'Cambridge Modern History' have already destroyed many of the fictions which had masqueraded as facts during the century. But as yet no detailed study of this period, based upon the archives, has appeared. Castlereagh's career has attracted but little attention and sympathy.

There is no detailed account in English of the congress of Vienna, still less of the later congresses of Aix-la-Chapelle, Troppau, and Laibach. Yet, even if it be not admitted that Castlereagh was himself a great statesman, the circumstances of his life make the policy of England during his period of office well worthy of particular attention. From 1814 to 1822 England was connected with the Continent by ties far stronger than any which have bound her before or since. Not merely was she bound by treaties of exceptional character, but her leading statesman had exceptional personal relations with those of the other powers during a period which has never been surpassed in the invention of new methods of diplomacy, and the solution of difficult problems of immense importance. In these questions Castlereagh took a leading, at times a dominant, part. He was the creator of the great treaty which made it certain that Napoleon would no longer rule over France; he was the decisive factor at the Congress of Vienna, for it was he alone who made England take so commanding a position in the critical questions of Poland and Saxony; and he had perhaps a greater share than any other statesman in securing that period of comparative peace for Europe which was the first necessity of its future progress.

Moreover, his position was such that the evidence of the British archives is especially important. He was the only one of the great European ministers who had to give an account of the policy of Europe. He must at least explain his position to his colleagues in the Cabinet, if not to the nation at large. The sovereigns of Russia, Austria, and Prussia went with their ministers to the congresses; France was for long outside the pale of the alliance; Castlereagh not only shared the secrets of European diplomacy, but had to obtain the sanction of the Cabinet for the attitude he adopted towards them. Thus, though Castlereagh probably took as much care as most statesmen to cover his tracks, yet the exigencies of his position probably forced him to put more truth on paper than any other diplomatist of his

time, and thus the documents that came from his office must always rank as one of the chief sources for the history of this period.

The correspondence for the years 1814–22, including the Continent and Congress documents, amounts to about one thousand volumes. Many of these have of course been used by more than one historian; but the diplomacy at the various centres is so interconnected in a period, when Europe was really governed by a committee of the great powers, that the dispatches to one court can only be fully understood if those from other centres are also known. The faulty organisation of the Foreign Office of that day, and the caution of that of ours, has no doubt prevented us from seeing many documents of historical value; and there are often gaps in the correspondence, especially in the years 1814–15. These discrepancies are not made smaller by the rather loose distinction that ambassadors and ministers of that day made between public and private papers. This is, unfortunately, especially true of the congress documents; and the absence of many of the most important papers seems only to be able to be accounted for by the deliberate wish of English statesmen to conceal the details of some of their policy.

It is unfortunate also that during this period, at the most important courts in Europe, some of our representatives were not men of the highest ability. Lord Stewart, though his confidential relations with his brother and Metternich render his papers very interesting, was without any of the qualities necessary for the diplomatic service. Lord Cathcart, another soldier turned diplomatist, was entirely unable to cope with the subtle problems which the court of St. Petersburg presented. Sir Charles Stuart at Paris was in perpetual conflict with his own government, and the obstinacy with which he clung to his position was a poor substitute for the tact which was necessary to adorn it. At Berlin also we were poorly represented. Sir H. Wellesley at Madrid, William A'Court at Naples, and Lord

Clancarty at Frankfort and later at the Hague, were, however, men of clear intellect if not exalted talents, and Bagot and Strangford filled, in the later years of the period, difficult positions with considerable skill. On the whole, we were perhaps as well served as any other country at the time; and if the English ministry had not at its disposal so many sources of information as the Austrian, it was at least less likely to be supplied with ill-founded reports and undigested suspicions. It must not be forgotten, too, that for many years after the close of the Napoleonic War diplomatic circles were kept in exceptional activity by the fact that many transactions had been postponed or only partially settled at the conclusion of the great war. This produced very continuous intercourse between ambassadors and foreign ministers, and tended to make their relations more confidential and productive of information. In Paris, too, till the congress of Aix-la-Chapelle, the ambassadorial committee of the four great powers met regularly to discuss the affairs of France and to consider other questions referred to them by their governments. The result is that in the whole mass of correspondence we have a very large quantity of evidence, which, if it lacks too often details of the important points, presents possibilities of being combined with the evidence which we already possess from private sources in a way which can perhaps give us an accurate picture of the whole period.

It is the object of this paper to try and illustrate the value of these documents by giving a short account of two transactions, on which they seem to throw some new light, and which reveal also something of the aims and methods of Castlereagh's policy.

I.—Castlereagh's 'Projet de Declaration' at the Congress of Vienna

It is well known that the great powers at the Vienna Congress had at one period the intention of consecrating their work in some shape which should do more to ensure

its permanence than the forms of a simple treaty.[1] It is also known that there existed a plan to bring even the Porte within the European state system and thus prevent the dreaded rupture between it and Russia.[2] The connexion, however, between these two transactions, and the share that Castlereagh had in them, does not seem to have been fully realised, though it might in part have been deduced from printed documents. The scheme indeed proved fruitless; yet it is perhaps remarkable that a plan of such immense significance, which reveals something of the impression in which the representatives of the powers regarded their work, should not have attracted more attention from historians. In the making of this scheme Castlereagh played a foremost part; for no one wished more than he to ensure the permanence of the settlement which had been at last concluded after so much anxiety. As soon as the Czar had yielded, with as much grace as possible, in the Polish-Saxon question, Castlereagh seized the opportunity to open this important point. The circumstances under which he made the proposal are best related in his own words.[3] On February 13, 1815, he wrote to his Cabinet as follows:—

'The leading territorial arrangements have been wound up with a degree of good humour which I certainly did not expect to witness among the powers, from what had passed in the earlier stages of our proceedings, and it is but justice to the Emperor of Russia to state, that the course of his conduct latterly has materially contributed to this honourable result. . . . From what I had myself before observed from what dropped from His Imperial Majesty in a former conversation with the Duke of Wellington and also with the Emperor of Austria, it was obvious that the Emperor of Russia's purpose was to try

[1] Gentz indeed announced as much to the public in the *Oesterreichischer Beobachter*, June 12, 1815: *cf.* Gervinus, *Geschichte des XIX^ten Jahrhunderts*, i. 249.

[2] See *e.g.* Beer, *Die orientalische Politik Oesterreichs seit* 1774, p. 265. Mr. Alison Phillipps' article in the *Cambridge Modern History*, x. 175.

[3] Castlereagh to Liverpool, Feb. 13, 1815. *F.O. Continent*, 12.

and renew the Quadruple Alliance before he left Vienna. I thought it material to dissipate this notion by representing the objections to the formation of any alliance at this moment to the exclusion of France. That on the contrary after the proofs which we had received on the Saxon and other points of the desire felt by the Cabinet of the Thuilleries to pursue a conciliatory and moderate line of policy, our interest and duty equally required that we should encourage such a disposition and thus strengthen the king's authority against the bad principles that must still abound in France, and I submitted to the Emperor that the best Alliance that could be formed in the present state of Europe was, that the powers who had made the Peace should by a public declaration at the close of the Congress, announce to Europe whatever difference of opinion may have existed in the details, their determination to uphold and support the arrangements agreed upon; and further their determination to unite their influence and if necessary their arms, against the power that should attempt to disturb it.

'The Emperor entered cordially into this idea and desired a Projet of Declaration to be prepared. The other ministers, viz. Princes Metternich, Talleyrand and Hardenberg, to whom this suggestion has since been communicated, equally approve it, and I hope we shall by this expedient have avoided without offence, lending ourselves to any exclusive system of alliance at present, which I found an equal desire in the Austrian minister to press upon us, but in the spirit of the late treaty; Prince Talleyrand urged the same idea with me, but was perfectly reasonable, when the objections were explained to him. . . .

'PS.—I enclose the Projet of Declaration alluded to in this dispatch. It has been prepared by M. Gentz on my suggestion. The Emperor highly approves of it, as do all the ministers of the other powers. Prince Talleyrand only wishes to soften the reference to revolutionary France by rather referring to her regeneration. I hope in approving the sentiments contained in this declaration, that the remaining deliberations will be conducted by the Imperial Powers in its spirit.'

This 'Projet of Declaration'[1] has long been in print.

[1] See Angeberg, *Congrès de Vienne*, ii. 864, and Gagern, *Mein Antheil an der Politik*, ii. 320. Gagern knew that the *Projet* was inspired by England, and was not very satisfied with its redaction. He wrote: 'Les anglais avoient déjà fait préparer par M. Gentz une espèce d'adieu au

It is a verbose document, which, after recapitulating the aims of the congress and the difficulties which have been encountered in reaching a settlement of the necessity of members, issues the statement :—

'Que les souverains, en se séparant aujourd'hui, suffisamment unis par le souvenir de leurs malheurs passés et par le sentiment commun de leur intérêt suprême n'ont formé qu'un seul engagement, simple et sacré, celui de subordonner toute autre considération au maintien inviolable de la paix et d'étouffer dès sa naissance, par ses démarches communes et bien concertées, ou, si cette arme pacifique venait à manquer, par la réunion sincère de tous les moyens que la Providence leur à confiés, tout projet qui tendrait à boulverser l'ordre établi, et à provoquer de nouveau les désordres et les calamités de la guerre.'

This language would have strengthened the ordinary covenants of the treaty and demonstrated to Europe the special sanctity of the Vienna settlement. Its primary intention, perhaps, was to guarantee the new territorial arrangements until all the powers involved should be mutually bound by a legal contract, yet the terms in which the Projet was conceived show that Castlereagh at least shared to some extent the views of these publicists who were hoping to see constructed a treaty more enduring and more sacred than any that had preceded it. Yet that he was convinced of the possibility of the success of his scheme there can be no doubt ; for, before he left the congress, he sent a message to his ministers at the European courts, which concluded with the statement :—

'It affords me great satisfaction to acquaint you that there is every prospect of the Congress terminating with a *general accord and guarantee* between the great powers of Europe, with a determination to support the arrangement agreed upon, and to turn the general influence and if necessary the general

nom du congrès pour dire à peupres : "nous n'avons pas sçu mieux faire." Je joins ici ce pièce. Des connoisseurs pensent que le style n'en est pas assez simple, ni le français assez pur et je doute quelle soit adoptée' (*op. cit.* p. 133).

arms against the power that shall first attempt to disturb the Continental Peace.' [1]

This scheme, however, was put forward not merely in the interests of European peace, but also in the special interests of the Porte. The hastily concluded treaty of Bucharest had left behind it many points of dispute, of which Russia, whose vast army was now slowly retiring after the defeat of Napoleon, could easily take advantage to force a rupture. The Turkish Government were not ignorant of their peril. They hoped to avoid it if possible by an appeal to Europe, which should at once guarantee their dominions and at the same time make Russia surrender to them the Asiatic frontier, of which she had, contrary to the treaty, kept possession since Bucharest. This resolution was taken as early as March 1814; [2] and in July of the same year the English ambassador was approached, and he advised the Porte to apply to the congress that was about to assemble at Vienna, at the same time offering to refer their disputes with Russia to the arbitration of the powers.[3] England was not however trusted, and it was to Austria that the Porte looked to defend its interests. Metternich promised to bring forward its demands, but was really in no mood to risk a rupture with Russia, when other questions demanded so much of his attention.[4] No doubt he discussed the question with Castlereagh. In any case, it was this minister who first brought up the subject in connexion with the general guarantee of which I have just made mention. The connexion is seen in the following dispatch to the British ambassador of the Porte of February 1815.[5]

[1] Circular dispatch, Feb. 13, 1815. *F.O. Continent*, 8.

[2] Sir Robt. Liston to Castlereagh, March 10, 1814. *F.O. Turkey*, 82.

[3] Sir Robt. Liston to Castlereagh, July 25, 1814. *F.O. Turkey*, 82.

[4] Gentz, *Dépêches inédites*, tom. i. pp. 121, 142.

[5] Castlereagh to Liston, Feb. 14, 1815. *F.O. Continent*, 12. Mr. Alison Phillipps has drawn attention to this dispatch: see *Cambridge Modern History*, x. 803. In the same volume there is also a record of a conversation of Castlereagh with Macvrogeni, the Turkish representative, on the subject.

'I have . . . been honoured with a personal interview with the Emperor of Russia, and have received from His Imperial Majesty the most distinct and satisfactory assurances of his disposition to concur with the other powers in including the Ottoman Porte in the general guarantee to which the present Congress is likely to give occasion, reserving only for a distinct settlement the points of difference now pending for the amicable adjustment of which the Emperor is willing to accept the intervention of Great Britain, Austria and France. His Imperial Majesty expressed his wish thus to terminate every misunderstanding that might either menace or disturb the general tranquillity.

You will take the earliest opportunity of opening this important communication to the Porte and you may acquaint the Turkish government that I have communicated this overture both to Prince Metternich and to Prince Talleyrand,[1] and that they concur with me in the opinion that the Porte ought to lose no time in giving authority to their minister here to take advantage of an offer so favourable to the general tranquillity and to the particular interests of the Ottoman state. . . .'

But the Porte refused the offer of the powers. The Turkish chargé d'affaires at Vienna submitted the proposal in as tempting a form as was possible; and Liston, at the request of the Sultan's ministers, also made a formal offer in writing.[2] But the war party at Constantinople was in the ascendant, and public opinion would not allow the Sultan, had he so wished, to submit to arbitration a question in which the sovereign rights of the Moslem Empire were involved. Even before the news of Napoleon's return from Elba, the Porte had determined to reject the proposal, and began instead to increase its preparation for war.[3]

Of the fate of the larger scheme there was also little doubt as soon as the news of Napoleon's return was known. The proposal for a general guarantee was dropped, and the

[1] Talleyrand appears, however, to have been only partly informed of the nature of the transaction: cf. *Correspondance du Comte de Jancourt avec le Prince de Talleyrand pendant le Congrès de Vienne*, p. 217.

Liston to Wellington, March 25, 1815. *F.O. Congress*, 26.

Liston to Wellington, April 4, 1815. *F.O. Misc.*, 95/23.

results of the congress were issued in the form of a simple treaty. There was indeed some attempt to delay the final settlement until the war was over, so that the final shape of the treaty could be further considered. But Talleyrand saw in the proposal an attempt to injure the interests of the Bourbons, and Clancarty supported him on behalf of England. It was perhaps not unwise that a treaty which was to be broken so often in the course of the century was not further protected.[1]

One other interesting point in regard to this transaction remains to be considered. According to the Czar's own account to Castlereagh, it was this abortive proposal of a general guarantee which first suggested to him the idea of the Holy Alliance. Alexander, too, was filled with the necessity of safeguarding the peace of Europe. According to him, the principles of this document must in any case rule the future diplomacy of Europe.[2] But the treaty of the Holy Alliance, which was for so long to be the symbol of reaction, was communicated in the first place to Castlereagh as founded upon this *projet*.[3] Castlereagh thus shares with Madame de Krudener the honour of suggesting to the Czar the famous treaty. But it is to be noticed that the *project* and the treaty of the Holy Alliance differ in two essential points. Castlereagh's scheme was a *territorial* guarantee,

[1] I am as yet unable to trace the exact course of the subsequent developments. According to Gentz, both Russia and England opposed the scheme at a later date (*loc. cit.* p. 165). According to a Russian 'Projet d'instruction,' the issue was still doubtful on May 25 (Shilder, *History of Alexander I*, iii. p. 540). Talleyrand also claimed credit for defeating a similar scheme at the close of the congress (Talleyrand, *Memoirs*, iii. 210). I have been unable to find any documents in the Record Office dealing with subsequent English policy.

[2] 'Mais soit que le pacte des garanties réciproques basse partie de l'instrument général du congrès, soit qu'en raison des circonstances actuelles, les autres cabinets se décident à en ajourner la sanction, les principes de ce pacte étant inhérents à ceux qui ont reglé la réconstruction européenne il s'en suit necessairement, que les Puissances seront dont le cas de s'y conformer, sans y être astreintes par une stipulation. diplomatique' (Shilder, *loc. cit.*).

[3] Wellington, *Supplementary Dispatches*, xi. 176.

while the Czar's alliance was one between *sovereigns*. Moreover, while Castlereagh intended to use his plan as a means to fortify the Turkish Empire against impending dangers, it was a fact which arrested the attention of all Europe that the treaty of the Holy Alliance was so worded that only Christian sovereigns could sign it.

II.—Castlereagh and Metternich, 1815–1817

Castlereagh's relations with Metternich have generally been misunderstood. The close union that existed between the two statesmen has often been attributed to the fact that Castlereagh was dominated by the Austrian minister and followed, to the injury of the interest of his own country, a policy dictated from Vienna. This charge is entirely untrue, and indeed has already been refuted, but the exact connexion between the two ministers is worthy of detailed study, for on it depended the solution of many of the problems with which Europe was faced. I propose to show how, in the years immediately succeeding the Vienna Congress, Metternich sought in vain to make the connexion between the two courts more definite and how this offer was rejected by the caution of the English minister.

In 1814 England had looked to Prussia rather than to Austria as its point of connexion on the Continent. The ties that connected this country with northern Germany and the fact that Prussia was the power to which England looked to guard the Rhine frontier, no less than a distrust of the earlier francophil policy of Metternich, made this a necessity. But from Castlereagh's first personal connexion with the European statesmen he had found Metternich much easier to work with than any other leader of the confederacy. When he was engaged in forging the bands by which the members of the alliance were to be held together until Napoleon was overthrown, he wrote :—

'[Metternich] is constitutionally temporising :—he is charged with more faults than belong to him, but he has his full share,

mixed up however with considerable means for carrying forward the machine more than any other person I have met with at head-quarters.' [1]

During subsequent transactions at Vienna and Paris, Castlereagh and Metternich had shown that they were the two practical members of the alliance. After the second peace of Paris, Austria was the only power to which Great Britain could look for the support of her interests. In France another revolution might be expected at any moment. Prussian statesmen had demonstrated their complete incompetence, and Russia, in deed if not in word, was the declared rival of Great Britain. It was to Austria, then, that England must look to preserve the peace of Europe alike against the dangers of revolutionary France and the suspected designs of the mysterious Russia, and thus secure at least a breathing-space (English statesmen dared scarcely hope for a long peace) to give time for the wealth and manufacturers of this country to recover, so that if need be she could again protect her own safety and that of Europe. Many problems had been left unsolved in the course of a settlement which had affected every power in Europe, and, fortunately, in almost every case, in these difficulties the interests of Austria and Great Britain were identical, and, where they were not, either one or the other possessed such a superior position that it was easy for its ally to give way.

Castlereagh was thus prepared to act in the closest alliance with Metternich on almost every subject of European diplomacy, and the result was that there existed between the two courts confidential relations such as have rarely connected this country with another power. The information that their respective agents supplied was communicated by one court to the other almost without reserve. 'For England,' wrote Lord Stewart in 1816, 'I

[1] Castlereagh to Liverpool, Chaumont, Feb. 26, 1814. *F.O. Congress*, 2. For Metternich's first impression of Castlereagh, see Fournier, *Der Congress von Chatillon*, pp. 251, 252.

really believe Austria has no secrets, and it shall be the study of my transactions with this court that she shall have none'; [1] and the English archives bear witness to the vast quantity of Austrian dispatches that were sent to London. Meanwhile, at the various storm centres of Europe, their representatives were in the closest confidential relations. At Madrid, Naples, and above all Constantinople, the policy of the two courts was one; and if a subordinate for a moment introduced an element of friction he was soon pulled up by the instructions from his court.

'Upon all great principles of action [wrote Lord Stewart] there is not a shade of difference in the political system of the two Governments; their wishes, their interests, their great conceptions being truly united and the minds of their statesmen on all main objects interwoven.'

In acting thus, however, Castlereagh was fully aware of the true character of his ally. He was in no way blind to those qualities of Metternich which have often furnished a theme for the pens of historians. There is ample evidence to show that he looked upon Metternich as a timid statesman. He was also aware that he was a dishonest one. Naturally, this is an opinion which does not often find a place in the public dispatches, but it occasionally slips into a draft. Thus in regard to a recent transaction he wrote to the British Ambassador at Naples :—

'[Metternich] with a great deal of personal merit, of sound principle upon the great politics of Europe, does upon smaller questions allow himself to be involved in contradictory obligations [which he endeavours afterwards to manage by the most complete double dealing].' [2]

If Castlereagh allied himself with Metternich he did so with his eyes open to the fact that Metternich could be both cowardly and treacherous. But it was because he felt that

[1] Stewart to Castlereagh, June 23, 1816. *F.O. Austria*, 127.
[2] Castlereagh to A'Court, Jan. 1, 1816. *F.O. Sicily*, 74.

the interests of Austria made it necessary for her to follow a policy which was in harmony with his own, that he was prepared to draw closely to her, though, as will be seen, not as closely as Metternich desired: an Austrian alliance was in fact in the circumstances a political necessity, and that being so Castlereagh did not shrink from the consequences of his position. A letter which he wrote in March 1818, perhaps shows his attitude as he would have stated any time during the years 1815–18:—

'I was much obliged to you for your reports of Metternich's instructions to Lebzeltern and Vincent: you know I reckon His Highness somewhat volcanick and endeavour to keep his eruptions within bounds, or rather out of the sight of certain of our allies, for it is not that I misunderstand them, on the contrary no one regards Metternich more than I do, or does more justice to his shining as well as his solid merits, but I sometimes fear his picture is submitted to eyes for which it is not intended, and that he may thereby lose a part of his means of managing and controuling that which he cannot himself be prepared to pronounce as yet requiring a ruder remedy. However every man has his own mode of operating, and as I have long known and regarded the Austrian minister, and found it not only practicable, but most satisfactory to act with him, *in the most trying circumstances*, I am quite prepared to consider the closest tie, viz., that of *for better for worse*, as my motto with him, and I beg you will always assure him of my unalterable regard and esteem.'[1]

Thus Austria and Great Britain acted in the closest harmony in all those problems, which the settlement of Vienna and Paris had left to the allied powers. In Italy and Germany, Castlereagh supported the policy of Metternich and was in turn supported by him on questions in which England had a dominant interest, especially over the immensely important question of the Spanish colonies. On every point Austria and England were opposed by the unconcealed hostility of Alexander, or at least of his agents.

[1] Castlereagh to Gordon, March 11, 1818. *F.O. Austria*, 133.

It was the dread of the menacing power of the Russian army, and the suspicious relations of the Russian court with the Bourbon powers, that united the bonds of the Austrian-English Alliance. It was impossible to tell to what end the mysterious activity of the Russian agents was directed. Not merely was there danger of a rupture between the Sultan and the Czar, but Russia had been brought into new connexions with every corner of Europe by the part she had played in the downfall of Napoleon. English and Austrian interests alike were threatened by this new factor in European diplomacy, and both statesmen were fully alive to the situation. But Castlereagh and Metternich were not agreed as to the proper method of dealing with the strange phenomenon that Alexander now presented. Metternich desired a far more open display of hostility and a far closer alliance than Castlereagh was prepared to admit.

Reports of Russian intrigue were pouring into the Foreign Office from every quarter of Europe. The dispatches from almost every court were filled with accounts of the almost open hostility which the Russian agents displayed towards Great Britain. At Paris, Madrid, and Constantinople the representatives of England and Russia were at open strife. Alexander was challenging British influence and acting against British interests on questions in which no other power had refused to recognise her supremacy. In both maritime and colonial questions it was Russia who headed the opposition to British policy, and at times with a success which was as injurious to the interests of this country as it was humiliating to its pride. Metternich did not fail to take advantage of this state of affairs. The Austrian court never wearied in directing the attention of Great Britain to every act of Alexander that could be construed as proof of Russian plans of aggrandisement. He advocated a system of open hostility to the Czar in which England should take the foremost part, and he hoped, not merely to make England bear the main burden of

opposing Russia's plans, but to seize the opportunity to bind England to Austria by closer ties than those of friendship—in fact, to bring about a secret treaty of alliance between the two countries.

Castlereagh, however, though far from being satisfied with Alexander's policy, had another method of treating the problem. His own ambassadors were not encouraged in their hostility to Russia and were ordered to conform their language to the principles of the alliance. Alexander was to be treated as an ally, until he was found out. He was at least to be given no excuse to form a new system of his own by the creation of a premature combination against him. Castlereagh reiterated in dispatch after dispatch the danger of suspecting Alexander too much, and thus perhaps producing the very evils which were so much feared. Two dispatches to Lord Stewart state his policy very clearly :—

'Prince Metternich mistakes the sentiments of this court if he supposes that we urge him to adopt either a submissive or conceding policy towards Russia: we entirely agree in his opinion that small sacrifices unnecessarily made might bring on a demand for greater.

'It is not in the maintenance of her just pretensions that we would discourage Austria; we only wish to moderate that "Cri de Bureau" against Russia which must to a degree exist in all Governments against a state so powerful as Russia has latterly become but which prevails (perhaps not unnaturally) amongst the Austrian Agents at home and abroad in a much greater degree than elsewhere. We conscientiously believe that if this temper is not repressed, and that with some vigour, by those at the head of affairs that it has a direct and rapid tendency to create the very danger which it would attempt to avoid and I think I could quote recent instances of the exaggerated disquietudes in which this system has kept the Court of Austria and through that Court the rest of Europe, since we separated at Paris.

'The evil I allude to would I am confident have existed at this day amongst our own agents, perhaps not less extensively if their attention had not been pointedly called to the larger views of our political relations.

'All we desire under this head from Prince Metternich is that he would assuage and not excite, the jealousy of his subordinate agents, which, in the intrigue of diplomacy, when countenanced at court, alternatively operates as cause and effect to disturb political relations, and to engender a thousand embarrassments that never would otherwise find their way to the seat of Government.' [1]

And in reference to the emperor's refusal to reduce his armaments he wrote :—

'As the Emperor likes an army, as he likes an influence in Europe and is under an impression of some alarm with respect of the political effervescence of the times, I do not expect him very rapidly to part with the troops he has formed nor should we from this circumstance alone call in question his pacific dispositions, but as the reduction of this army involves that of other states or in this view essentially bears upon the relief the Finances of Europe so generally require, everything that can form an inducement to the Emperor to let it down should be attended to. For this purpose I place in the first rank of importance the closing as early as possible the several questions that are yet open in Europe, or the opening as few as possible for discussion whilst the public mind of all states is yet agitated by the fear of the French Revolution and the military temper to which it has given birth. This with a frank and conciliatory system of diplomacy, holding fast to the principles of the alliance, which now happily exists, is likely to bring the motives of internal economy to bear with the most effect upon the military expenditure of Russia, and in proportion as matters appear settled abroad the national feeling will press in Russia for a reduction of force.' [2]

And in a private letter that accompanied this dispatch, Castlereagh gave the keynote of his policy.

'My opinion still is that, with proper management, the Emperor's particular character may be made in itself an instrument for neutralising and counteracting the danger with which that State abounds ; but, in this respect, whatever may

[1] Castlereagh to Stewart (private), July 9, 1816. *F.O. Austria*, 125.
[2] Castlereagh to Stewart and Clancarty, Aug. 6, 1816. *F.O. Germany*, 8.

be the issue—and prophecy in politics is a very idle occupation—sure I am that the policy of Europe towards the Emperor is clear; which is all that can rationally deserve attention at the present moment.'[1]

Such, however, was not Metternich's point of view. For a time, indeed, he abandoned any idea of a closer alliance with England, and his dispatches became calmer in tone. But at the beginning of the year 1817 he made an attempt to obtain some tangible connexion with the English court. The news that Russian intrigues had begun again at Madrid must, he knew, awake the suspicions of the English ministry. He tried further to alarm them as to the situation in the East, and Stewart was informed of the certainty of Russia's designs upon Asiatic Turkey.[2] He hoped that England, thus threatened at two of its main centres of influence in the Mediterranean, would be at last ready to listen to some proposal for a secret alliance against the Czar. Esterhazy was now furnished with one of Metternich's reviews of European politics which he was to communicate to Castlereagh. The intrigues of Russia with the Bourbon Courts are reviewed and the necessity of rescuing France from her influence is strongly maintained. To this end the two states of Austria and England must devote their efforts and try to come to some understanding with the French government.

'La protection plus speciale [wrote Metternich] que l'Empereur de Russie cherche à établir sur les differents branches de la maison de Bourbon sera déjouée, si l'Autriche et l'Angleterre parviennent à s'assurer de la confiance du gouvernement français. Un grand intérêt permanent et commun lie ces trois puissances contre les vues de conquêtes les plus prochaines de la Russie. La conservation de l'état de possession de la Porte servira de ciment à leur Alliance veritablement morale. . . . La Russie peut être isolée et ses vues ambitionnées par consequent être

[1] Castlereagh to Stewart and Clancarty. *Cas. Mem.*, xi. 275.
[2] Stewart to Castlereagh, Jan. 5, 1817. *F.O. Austria*, 134.

circonscrites ; et si elles devoient ne pas l'être, la faute n'en seroit sans doute qu'aux puissances elles-mêmes.' [1]

The object of this desire to 'isolate' Russia was made clearer by an interview which Metternich had with the English ambassador at Vienna, when he communicated to him the above dispatch to Esterhazy.

'It appeared to me [wrote Lord Stewart] that the Austrian Minister was very desirous of ascertaining from us the utmost length we should be prepared to go in the tone, language, and even means we should employ in the event of the negotiations at Constantinople taking an unfavourable turn. All this, however, was covered by an ardent desire of the most complete union, reciprocal confidence and explanation with us in our minutest proceedings, which could alone preserve that balance, that appeared so necessary against the further strides of aggrandizement and encroachment with which we were threatened. . . . The Prince then urged me to induce your Lordship to make a complete development of your views, without reserve and without restriction, upon the most unfavourable issue that might arise to the present position of European affairs : I remarked to His Highness, that he must be sensible of the disposition of the Prince Regent's government, to act in the closest concert : I did not see in what your Lordship could make it more or make it more evident, than in your late consultations on the instructions sent to Constantinople, where our ministers spoke but one language in which they were joined by Prussia, and by your general unity of action in all the important concerns that were still pending, as also in your Lordship's constant solicitude to hear the sentiments and ascertain the views of this Cabinet. The Prince said that it was true everything was in the best train, but the ample explanations of Austria, England, Prussia, and he trusted France, must still be more extensive. To secure the latter from the influence of Russia and place her on the same line with ourselves was unquestionably the point of the greatest solicitude, and this he trusted by the retiring tranquillity and steadiness of the King of France's government would be affected. . . . For his own part he considered the Quadruple Alliance as the great palladium upon which the peace of Europe depended.

[1] Metternich to Esterhazy, March 26, 1817. *F.O. Austria*, 138.

In this the Emperor of Russia was so bound up that he could not extricate himself from its obligations, without sacrificing all his principles. To this therefore we must endeavour that Russia should ever cling. But at the same time it became necessary to prevent an extension of the means of one Empire already too formidable, to counteract designs of a suspicious nature, and this could be done but by a thorough knowledge and understanding of those designs, and an unanimous line of opinion and conduct in the mode of opposing them. Every day brought fresh intelligence of a questionable form. . . .

What then was to be done? but concert together the means by which the negotiations going on at Constantinople were to be considered, and treated by the other great allied powers of Europe, and what language they were to hold in case of a rupture. This was a very serious question, but His Highness did not see how we are to be prepared to meet a crisis that threatened, without the most entire exposure of our views, means, and mode of action.

'I considered it judicious not to prolong this conversation, I felt it was with a view of drawing forth opinions or extorting ideas in which I was in no way instructed. It gave me the impression of some sort of treaty, or a wish to understand, if on any bearing of the Turkish question England would go to war; although there was nothing direct that was absolutely stated by the Prince.'[1]

This overture, the real intention of which, however delicately conveyed, could not be mistaken, received no encouragement from Castlereagh. His reply was clear and direct, and he remained firm to the policy he had enunciated in the previous year. He wrote on May 5 to Lord Stewart—

'The Austrian Ambassador has communicated to me a confidential despatch of Prince Metternich which bears date 26th March. . . .

'Upon the general outline of the European picture which Prince Metternich has sketched and upon the course of policy which Austria proposes to pursue, it is unnecessary to remark. Although represented in new and impressive colouring, this view of our general situation has been often considered in my

[1] Stewart to Castlereagh, March 24, 1816. *F.O. Austria*, 135.

correspondence with your Excellency, and you are already in possession of everything I can well say upon it. The principles laid down by Prince Metternich when taken in the abstract, and with due caution in their application, are perfectly wise and sound, and no difference of opinion can arise upon them, but while we all agreed in considering the Quadruple Alliance, combined with a system of conciliation and support to the existing order of things established in France, as the basis of all our policy, we must proceed with circumspection in adopting any measures of precautionary policy upon speculative grounds, which might prove fatal to the system itself. In our practical views upon this subject I am persuaded we must mean the same thing as to preserve the system which exists as long as possible,—that, if it is shaken, the fault shall not be with either court: and to secure this object that nothing should be done, either upon chance, or upon suspicion, inconsistent with our declared relations: and that whilst the *Elements of Security*, in the good-will of other powers are cultivated, it should be left to the hand of actual necessity to combine them, if it should ever be unfortunately requisite, as the development of an ascertained danger shall point out. . . . Judging from the sources of information to which this government has access we do not see the danger which threatens the peace of Europe from the power of Russia in so strong a point of view as the Austrian minister does, either in degree or proximity, and we further conceive that he overrates his available means, at the present moment, of providing against it. Should the alarms to which the Austrian dispatch points, unfortunately be realised, it is reasonable to presume that both Prussia and France might be disposed in concert with Austria and Great Britain to take an active part in opposing a barrier to such a danger at the present moment to be imminent—and neither Government, I am confident, would adopt by anticipation, an attitude, which could tend either to vary or embarrass their existing relations with Russia. . . . In this state of things I have requested Prince Esterhazy to submit to Prince Metternich, whether it may not be prudent to moderate the language of alarm, and not to adopt too exacting a policy either at Berlin or Paris which might tend rather to check than ripen the disposition of those powers to unite in case of *real and obvious danger*; neither of these powers will or ought to compromise themselves with Russia upon a doubtful case; and therefore, whilst every-

thing should be done to promote a facility of intercourse between the two powers that might be called under possible circumstances, to counteract Russian encroachments, I don't yet see any grounds which would justify a distinct step being now taken to establish a concert founded upon the assumption of such a danger; and in this conclusion I do not believe that Prince Metternich materially differs.' [1]

Such language as this made Metternich's plan impossible and he had to abandon his design of creating a secret alliance against Russia amongst the other members of the European confederacy. That such had been his aim Lord Stewart was further convinced by Esterhazy's report of his interview with Castlereagh.

'Prince Esterhazy observes with regret [he wrote] that your Lordship does not seem disposed to enter into a more active system of precaution against Russian encroachments, which he conceives would be more acceptable to his own Government and Prince Metternich's ideas; and I am thus more confirmed in my opinion that the Austrian Minister's first desire was to secure without loss of time the Courts of London, Paris, and Berlin in some engagement that would bind them to act together in the possible contingency of Russia's overstepping the bonds in which she is now held.' [2]

Metternich did not broach the project again, and though the relations between the two statesmen continued to be of the closest, until the end of Castlereagh's career, no more is heard of any secret alliance. The Austrian court could but seek to keep English suspicions awake by communicating all the information concerning Russian intrigues which his industrious agents procured for him from every quarter of Europe, and purchase England's goodwill by a continuous support of her policy in those questions in which England had a direct and Austria only a subordinate interest. Meanwhile, freed from entangling alliances, but assured of support in case of necessity, Castlereagh could

[1] Castlereagh to Stewart, May 5, 1817. *F.O. Austria*, 133.
[2] Stewart to Castlereagh, June 13, 1817. *F.O. Austria*, 136.

pursue his own method of dealing with Alexander. Flattery and not menace he regarded as the proper instrument to keep Alexander in the path of peace.

'To counteract the party in his Councils [he wrote to one of his ambassadors] that may be labouring to exasperate him against the Turks we must all, as far as possible never suffer His Imperial Majesty to forget what he has accomplished for Europe during the last four years, how much this now may be endangered, and his fame impaired by now measuring himself with such a Power, that the principle of acquisition once acted upon may loosen existing ties, and open interminable questions. Language of this description held in the spirit of confidence rather than of distrust in the Emperor's intentions, will serve to fortify his mind against those who may advise a Turkish war.' [1]

This policy he was able successfully to pursue, and his relations with the Czar continued to be of the most friendly description, much to Metternich's disgust. It was true that the most powerful of the emperor's ministers did not trouble to conceal his hatred and distrust of England, and the two courts continued to be at variance on almost every question of European politics. But Alexander never allowed his agents to go far enough to disturb the European alliance that was still so necessary to guard against the danger that might at any moment come from France. It was not until the outbreak of the Greek insurrection that the fear of a Russian-Turkish war became so pressing that Castlereagh had to resort again to a policy of menace, which, as he had shown at the congress of Vienna, he could use boldly and openly if the necessity arose.

These two glimpses into Castlereagh's methods of dealing with European politics, differing as they do in character, yet both reveal the cardinal point of his policy. From the downfall of Napoleon until the end of his life he more than any other statesman of the alliance was the guardian of the peace of Europe. To preserve unshaken

[1] Castlereagh to Rose, April 4, 1817. *F.O. Prussia*, 106.

that equilibrium of territorial power which he had done so much to establish at Vienna was the main object of his European policy. To this end he recognised that the alliance—that is, the Quadruple Alliance—was a valuable and indeed for some years a necessary factor ; and it must always be remembered that this new system of diplomacy was his invention and by him imposed upon Europe. When the alliance became diverted from the object for which it was designed and directed to the propagation of principles of absolutism, which England could not support, he was forced, though with many regrets at the advantages Europe was losing, to break away from the system which he had devised. Peace for Europe, as for England, was the object which he felt must be secured and to which all his efforts were directed. For this he was prepared to sacrifice much and, perhaps, more than was necessary. Yet we must always remember that for the moment it was peace and not the progress of nationality or liberalism that was the first necessity of Europe.

THE PARISH CLERGY OF THE THIRTEENTH AND FOURTEENTH CENTURIES

The Alexander Prize Essay, 1911–12

By H. G. RICHARDSON, M.A., B.Sc. (Econ.).

Read June 20, 1912

UNTIL the thirteenth century records touching the parish clergy are scanty, but thereafter they increase in bulk and, with the fourteenth century, there exist, side by side, a number of literary works which afford more than a passing glance at their lives and deeds. The parish priests and clerks of these centuries were not perhaps typical of the mediaeval period, since no century or centuries will afford a type of any class or institution which will be true for the whole of the Middle Ages ; and it is possible that the tenth-century parish and its people resembled the parish and people of the fourteenth century as little—or as much—as the Elizabethan parish resembled the parish of the present day. The changes that affected so profoundly the organisation of the manor during the course of the Middle Ages did not leave its counterpart, the parish, unaltered ; and the same economic forces that helped to make the villein a copyholder and serfdom an anachronism, helped also to raise the chaplain's wages from five to eight marks within thirty years of the Black Death.[1] But although the

[1] The stipend of a perpetual vicar was fixed at a minimum of five marks by the Council of Oxford (1222). This appears also to have been a usual amount for a chaplain to receive just prior to the Black Death, although it was frequently less. Archbishop Islip limited the amount of a chaplain's stipend to six marks immediately after the Black Death, and Archbishop Sudbury to eight marks in 1378. *Vide infra*, p. 113, and Lyndwood, *Provinciale*, 64, 65.

thirteenth and fourteenth centuries may not afford typical parish priests in typical mediaeval parishes, the paucity of material for the investigation of the preceding period and the difficulty of the succeeding period of disturbance and transition give at least a reasonable excuse for finding in those centuries the most satisfactory starting point for the study of the parish clergy of the Middle Ages.

Throughout the Middle Ages the English were essentially an agricultural people : the manor was the social unit, and, for the most part, the parish was co-extensive with the manor. The town parish, in so far as it was an organisation for artisans and traders rather than agriculturists, presents some difficulties : but at no period during the Middle Ages, save in a few populous centres, were town and country sharply differentiated ; and any peculiar features which the larger towns may have presented probably do not detract unduly from the general truth of the outlined picture which this paper seeks to present, based as it is principally upon evidence relating to rural conditions.

Who were the parish clergy ? It was essential, in the first place, that there should be a priest to perform the offices of the church ; but he need not be rector or perpetual vicar, and a considerable number of the parish priests [1] were merely stipendiary chaplains employed to perform the duties which otherwise the rectors and vicars, through lack of qualification or by reason of absence, would have left unperformed. The perpetual vicars were, however, most frequently priests bound to residence, for their class existed

[1] The priest in charge of a parish appears to have been given this title. Adam de Orleton sends a warning ' presbitero parochiali ac omnibus et singulis parochianis ecclesie de Kynardesleye,' when the benefice is vacant (*Reg. A. de Orleton*, 366). Alan de Creppynge is allowed to hold the church of Blaisdon at farm, but it is provided ' quod, quolibet anno dum duraverit dicta firma, j marca per visum Officialis et presbiteri loci parochianis pauperibus erogetur ' (*Reg. Th. de Cantilupo*, 217). Similarly ' Ricardo, parochiali presbitero de Chetintone ' is committed the custody of the parish church (*ibid.* 164).

to get the services of the church performed,[1] and, whether the appropriators or the bishop had the right of presentation, it was not to the advantage of either to present to the vicarage a man in minor orders or a man whose sole interest in his benefice was the right to receive its profits. The bishops of the thirteenth century shewed great activity in the matter of creating vicarages, and the particulars of many hundreds of ordinances can be found in the episcopal registers of that and the succeeding century. We possess, therefore, a considerable amount of detailed information concerning the clergy of parishes in which perpetual vicarages were created: and of those parishes it is possible to present a fairly complete picture. In the absence of reason to the contrary it is legitimate to suppose that this picture is, within limits, typical also of the parishes where the church had not been appropriated, the most singular differences being, in all probability, the superior qualifications and the restricted income and possessions of the perpetual vicar as compared with the rector: the poorer rectors, however, probably had as good qualifications as the average vicar, for when a church would support but a rector, he perforce must, if possible, be a priest,[2] since there was no surplus out of which to employ one for the duties which a clerk in minor orders was not competent to perform.

Often associated with the vicar—and more often still, perhaps, with the rector, acolyte or sub-deacon as he frequently was—were a number of other clergy, usually in minor orders, but in many cases priests, or chaplains as they were commonly called, who assisted at the parish church or

1 Wilkins, *Concilia*, I. 587, 'Statuimus igitur ut nullus episcoporum ad vicariam quemquam admittat, nisi velit in ecclesia, in qua ei vicaria conceditur, personaliter ministrare, ac talis existat, qui infra breve tempus valeat in presbyterum ordinari' (Concilium Oxoniense, 1222). See also Lyndwood, 64.

2 Wilkins, I. 571, 'Ut nullus nisi sacerdos admittatur ad aliquam ecclesiam, cujus aestimatio non excedet V. marcas; sed admissus residentiam faciat in eadem ecclesia' (Constitutiones W. de Bleys, Episcopi Wigorn., 1219).

served the chapels attached to it. There is considerable likelihood that all these parish clergy sometimes, perhaps generally, lived together under one roof. In many ordinances of vicarages the stipends of vicar, chaplains and minor clergy are stated not in individual sums, but as an aggregate amount; and in the stipulations as to their food, vicars, deacons and clerks are at times grouped together in such a way as to lead to the possible conclusion that they formed one household:[1] and this possibility is heightened by the fact that, together with the clergy, are mentioned the personal servants—garciones, servientes—of the vicars, who, deputed

[1] The Vicar of Bicester 'habebit pro stipendiis suis et capellani sui et clericorum suorum xl solidos annuatim . . . et ipse et capellanus ejus et clerici sui habebunt victum suum de prioratu ipsis capellanis et clericis competentem' (*Liber Antiquus*, 7). In the case of the vicarage of Breedon-on-the-Hill, with the chapels of Worthington and Stanton Harold, 'vicarius perpetuus habebit nomine vicarie sue sibi et duobus capellanis quos habebit socios, et diacono et duobus clericis suis, sufficientem exhibitionem victus ad mensam canonicorum' (*Rot. Hugonis de Welles*, II. 275). Similar provision is made in the case of the vicarages of Hinkley, where there are vicar, chaplain, deacon and clerk, and Owston, where there are vicar and deacon only (*ibid.*). In the case of Breedon, however, it is provided that 'canonici . . . tam dicto vicario quam capellanis suis mansos competentes extra prioratum assignabunt'; but this is perhaps explained by the fact that the chaplains had to serve the chapels which lay at some distance. The ordinance of the vicarage of St. Martin's, Leicester, shews that a distinction in the matter of food was sometimes made between vicar and deacon: 'Vicarius . . . habebit etiam victum suum de abbatia in omnibus sicut canonicus, et diaconus suus ut major serviens de abbatia . . . Preterea habebit panem ad garcionem suum qui ei serviet' (*Rot. H. de Welles*, II. 300). In the case of Humberstone vicarage, vicar and deacon get the same fare: 'Constitit autem dicta vicaria . . . in corredio duorum monachorum vicario et diacono suo . . .' (*Rot. Roberti Grosseteste*, 49). A similar provision is to be found in the case of Elsham Vicarage (*ibid.* 90). In the case of Sylvester, vicar (but not perpetual vicar and in minor orders) of Whitchurch, it is ordered 'quod omnibus diebus vite sue habeat capellanum secum commorantem, virum honestum et moribus commendabilem, qui sciat et possit parochianis in lingua eis nota, confessiones et alia spiritualia ministrare' (*Rot. H. de Welles*, I. 33). It is required of the Rector of Ullingswick 'quod . . . capellanum exhibeat' (*Reg. Th. de Cantilupo*, 241). There may be compared with these instances the frequent cases of coadjutors to infirm incumbents and those under age: e.g. *Reg. Walter Giffard*, 4; *Reg. R. de Swinfield*, 116; *Reg. J. de Halton*, 113, 135; *Reg. J. de Trillek*, 37, 110, 111, 178, 233, 236.

to such tasks as making beds and tending palfreys, could hardly have lived elsewhere than at the vicarage.[1]

A vicar's dwelling-house—and, equally, that of a rector also—whoever may have been its inmates, would in most parishes be found near the church. Such houses are variously described as being next the church, opposite the churchyard gate, before the church door, within the churchyard itself: it was regarded as of importance that the vicar should not live at a distance.[2] But apart from its

[1] The Vicar of St. Mary, Huntingdon, 'habebit clericum et garcionem suum ad mensam prioris cum clericis et garcionibus ejusdem' (*Lib. Ant.* 26). The Vicar of All Saints', Nottingham, is to have 'unum corredium monachale cotidianum in refectorio vel in camera prioris vel alibi ubi voluerit et serviens suus similiter unum corredium consimile habebit unius majorum servientum prioratus' (*ibid.* 34). The Vicar of Harrold 'item habebit diaconum et garcionem, quibus Priorissa ejusdem loci tam in necessariis victus quam in stipendiis providebit' (*Rot. H. de Welles*, III. 26; cf. *Lib. Ant.* 25). 'Vicarius de Swyneforde erit ad mensam hospitalariorum in eadem villa honorifice, sicut ille qui fratribus hospitalariis ibidem Preceptor preficietur . . . Clericus autem ipsius habebit ibi exhibitionem suam quoad victum honorifice tanquam unus de fratribus hospitalariis ejusdem domus et x solidos annuos pro stipendiis. Garcio vero, qui lectum suum faciet et palefridum suum custodiet, tanquam unus de garcionibus fratrum ibidem exhibebitur . . .' (*Rot. H. de Welles*, II. 297). The 'Ordinacio generalis super vicariis de Osen.' in the *Liber Antiquus* illustrates the relations between vicar, clerk and 'garcio': 'Canonici vero clericum idoneum ei et ejus obsequio devotum et ecclesie ministerio invenient qui juramentum fidelitatis et devocionis ipsi vicario prestabit salva fide dictorum Canonicorum, qui eciam ipsi vicario similiter garcionem invenient ipsius obsequio deputatum quos in omnibus suis expensis procurabunt. Ubi autem non fuerint canonici residentes, clericus qui ut supradictum est expensis ipsorum procurabitur clavem deferet in domo eorum et curam habebit liberam ut per ipsum vicario sufficienter in victualibus et honorifice necessaria ministrentur' (*Lib. Ant.* 1, 2). For other references to garciones see *Lib. Ant.* 34, 37, 61; *Rot. H. de Welles*, II. 300 (quoted above); *Rot. R. Grosseteste*, 29; 'valet' of rector of Norton David, *Reg. R. de Salopia*, 19.

[2] The Vicar of Wroxton is to have messuage and buildings 'que fuerunt Sampsonis juxta ecclesiam versus occidentem' (*Lib. Ant.* 7). The vicarage of Great Kimble consists, *inter alia*, in 'manso competente eidem vicarie assignato scilicet ex opposito porte cimiterii versus austrum' *ibid.* 15); Evenley vicarage, 'in manso a parva porta ipsorum canonicorum que ducit ad ecclesiam usque ad portam septentrionalem eorundem' (*ibid.* 36). The vicar of Houghton Conquest has a *mansum* 'ante januam ecclesie' (*Rot. H. de Welles*, I. 7); the vicar of Chalgrave has two crofts and a garden 'que sunt juxta ecclesiam . . . et minor crofta cum gardino

situation it is probable that in most parishes the vicar's house would not have been distinguishable from that of the superior villein's: and possibly many rectors, at all events the poorer rectors, had no more eligible dwelling-place. When a vicarage was created it was usual for the bishop to stipulate either that the vicar should have a certain specified house or that he should have a suitable one,[1] and what was regarded as suitable may be gathered from what was actually assigned. In many cases the house was described simply as that in which the chaplain[2] of the church, the rector,[3] the parson[4] or the priest[5] was wont

assignabitur ei pro manso' (*ibid.* III. 3; *Lib. Ant.* 22). The vicars of King's Pyon 'habeant illam mansionem . . . de novo constructam, videlicet inter ortum domini Gerardi de Gillesford, militis, ex parte una, et gardinum rectorie ecclesie predicte, ex altera, ex opposito cimiterii ejusdem situatam' (*Reg. R. de Swinfield*, 487). The Vicar of St. Peter, Colchester, has 'mansum competentem in solo cimiterii ecclesie ubi pro habitacione capellani parochialis dicte ecclesie mansio alias construebatur et construitur' (*Reg. Stephani Gravesend*, 210). *Cf.* 'tofto . . . usque orientalem partem ecclesie' [of Burton] (*Lib. Ant.* 49); 'tofto, et domo juxta ecclesiam [of Covenham], quod vocatur Kyrketoft' (*Rot. R. Grosseteste*, 125); 'mansum competentem juxta ecclesiam' [of Haxey] (*ibid.* 146); 'manso proximiori ecclesie' [of Stevington] (*Rot. H. de Welles*, III. 15); 'crofto et messuagio juxta cimiterium' [of Newbottle] (*ibid.* I. 48). The Abbot and Convent of Gloucester are to provide an acre and a half of ground near the church of Churcham and timber for a vicarage, it being ascertained that the vicar lives at a distance (*Reg. Th. de Cantilupo*, 237). The vicar of West Harptree is to have a house nearer to the church, and an amending ordinance is made to secure this (*Reg. R. of Shrewsbury*, 300, 510).

[1] *Lib. Ant.* 17, 'cum manso competente' (Medmenham); *ibid.* 18, 'cum quodam mesuagio ad mansionem capellani ydoneo' (Upton); *Rot. R. Grosseteste*, 146, 'habebit vicarius mansum competentem' (Haxey); *Reg. S. Gravesend*, 210, 'ad opus vicarii mansum competentem' (Colchester).

[2] *Lib. Ant.* 2, 'habebit . . . mansum ubi capellanus ecclesie solebat habitare' (St. Giles, Oxford); *ibid.* 6, 'manso cum crofta in quo capellanus ejusdem ecclesie manere consuevit' (Burton Abbots); *ibid.* 8, 'cum domibus et edificiis ubi capellanus consuevit habitare' (Elsfield); 'domos et curiam in quibus capellanus manere consuevit' (Headington).

[3] *Reg. Th. de Cantilupo*, 44, 'vicarius et successores sui habeant domos ecclesie quas solebant habere rectores ibidem pro manso suo' (Aymestry).

[4] *Lib. Ant.* 9, 'cum manso olim personis deputato' (Caversham); *ibid.* 52, 'ubi persona antiquitus manere solevit' (Swinderby).

[5] *Reg. W. Bronescombe*, 178, 'domum in qua presbiteri inhabitare consueverant' (St. Sithney): cf. *ibid.* 39, 'manso quem vicarius inhabitat' (Buckland Brewer).

to reside. At other times the adjoining owner was specified ; the vicar is to have the toft to the south of that of Matthew the clerk ; [1] the house between the prior's orchard and the lord's park ; [2] between Robert de Rowell the dean and Walter Poly ; [3] between Sir Gerard de Gillesford's orchard and the rectory garden.[4] Elsewhere the preceding occupier was named—old Thomas,[5] Robert de Acrinton,[6] Master Warin,[7] Osbert Sire,[8] Samson,[9] Roger Marchant ; [10] and in a few instances his occupation was mentioned—William the chaplain,[11] Thorald the parmenter,[12] Walter the reeve.[13] Always it would seem the vicar succeeded some humble priest or craftsman or other undistinguished inhabitant of the village.

There are other entries in the episcopal registers which attempt a more detailed description of the vicar's dwelling, particularly where part of a rectory house is assigned to him, and from these we may obtain a more precise idea of the accommodation afforded him. The four following descriptions occur in various registers over a period of more than a century, to be precise between 1247 and 1354, and

[1] *Lib. Ant.* 53 (Scopwick).

[2] *Rot. H. de Welles*, II. 40, ' manso idoneo inter pomerium Prioris et vivarium dominorum de Koges.'

[3] *Lib. Ant.* 69, ' manso qui jacet inter Robertum de Rowell decanum et Walterum Poly ' (Messingham).

[4] *Reg. R. de Swinfield*, 487 (quoted above).

[5] *Lib. Ant.* 2, ' domo quam Thomas senex tenuit ' (Great Barton).

[6] *Ibid.* 36, ' manso quem Robertus de Acrinton tenuit ' (Marston).

[7] *Rot. H. de Welles*, I. 77, ' mesuagio cum gardino quod magister Guarinus tenuit ' (Turvey : this is a mediety).

[8] *Rot. H. de Welles*, I. 53, 'manso in quo manet Osbertus Sire ' (Cassington).

[9] *Lib. Ant.* 7, ' messuagio et edificiis que fuerunt Sampsonis ' (Wroxton).

[10] *Rot. H. de Welles*, I. 207, ' mansum juxta ecclesiam qui fuit Rogeri Marchant.'

[11] *Lib. Ant.* 16, ' manso cum domibus Willielmi quondam capellani ' (Heddenham) : cf. *ibid.* 6, ' manso qui fuit W. quondam ejusdem loci vicarii et decani ' (Shipton).

[12] *Ibid.* 49, ' tofto quod fuit Thoraldi parmentarii ' (Burton).

[13] *Reg. W. Bronescombe*, 171, ' domo quam Walterus Prepositus inhabitare consuevit ' (St. Enoder).

are probably representative. The Vicar of Louth had a house and a kitchen and a little meadow, all enclosed within willows and a stone wall.[1] At Avenbury, the appropriators—the Abbot and Convent of Dore—took the principal chamber of the rectory, with the cellar beneath, a neighbouring outbuilding, the better barn and an orchard, while the vicar was given the rest of the house, with the hall and other buildings, another orchard and a herb garden.[2] Similarly to the Vicar of Awre were allotted the hall, the chambers and other buildings contained in the rectory, together with an adjoining garden, there being reserved to the Prior and Convent of Llanthony the grange, the churchyard, a croft and another garden.[3] The Vicar of West Harptree having first been allotted the greater part of the rectory, together with another house, was by a later ordinance given instead the house occupied by a tenant of the church. This lay opposite the gates of the rectory and consisted of a hall with a solar and a cellar at the front and a solar and cellar at the rear ; there were, besides, a kitchen, a grange, a stable for three horses and a dovecote.[4] It must have

[1] *Rot. R. Grosseteste*, 99 (1247–8), ' Que quidem vicaria consistit in toto altaragio, cum domo et coquina et parvo pratello . . . sicut salicibus et muro lapideo cingebantur. . . .'

[2] *Reg. A. de Orleton*, 203 (1321), ' reservata eisdem religiosis pro suis necessitatibus camera principaliori mansi in quo Rectores dicte ecclesie habitare consueverant, cum subjecto eidem camere celario et quadam domo sibi propinqua prope ortum inferiorem situata, et grangia seu horreo meliori, ac predicto orto inferiori, qui de prefata camera eis reservata versus pontem inferiorem se extendit, totum residuum mansum, cum aula, et ceteris edificiis, ac orto pomifero superiori, qui se extendit versus pontem superiorem cum adjacente sibi curtilagio seu herbario ad habitacionem ibidem servituri vicarii deputavit.'

[3] *Reg. J. de Trillek*, 243 (1354), ' vicarius . . . habeat pro habitacione sua aulam, cameras, et cetera edificia in manso rectorie dicte ecclesie constituta cum gardino eisdem contiguo ex parte boreali vie communis ibidem, grangia, area, gardino et crofto dicte ecclesie ex parte australi ejusdem vie nobis reservatis.'

[4] *Reg. R. of Shrewsbury*, 510 (1344). The ordinance which was amended was made in 1336 (*ibid.* 300) : ' vicarius . . . habeat omnes domus rectorie . . . cum columbari, curtillagio et gardino adjacentibus, exceptis et reservatis . . . grangiis, boveriis, stabulis . . . Habeat insuper dictus vicarius domos pro capellano parochiali dicte ecclesie solitas deputari.'

been a house very like this last—a carpenter's house, be it remembered—in which took place the incidents related in the 'Miller's Tale.'[1]

In such a house then dwelt the average vicar or rector—some rectors and perhaps a few vicars were better off—as was occupied by the wealthier craftsmen of his flock: here he dispensed some measure of hospitality[2] and kept a youth to serve him,[3] a horse to ride,[4] a hound and hawk[5] or two to hunt with—for the parish clergy were mighty,

[1] Nicholas 'A chambre hadde . . . in that hostelrye' (l. 3203). The carpenter and his wife presumably had another (ll. 3650 seq.). There was a garden and also a stable attached to the house (ll. 3571–2):

'. . . up-on the gable,
Unto the gardin-ward, over the stable.'

Nicholas' chamber was in the second storey, and could therefore be termed a solar (*cf.* ll. 3431 seq.):

'"Go up," quod he un-to his knave anoon,
"Clepe at his dore, or knokke with a stoon,
Loke how it is, and tel me boldely."'

As to the meaning of solar, see Skeat's *Chaucer*, V. 120.

[2] *Cf.* Lyndwood, 67–68 (note to 'Hospitales'), 132 (note to 'Hospitalitatis'). Myrc, *Instructions for Parish Priests*, ll. 51–52:

'Of mete and drynke þow moste be fre,
To pore and ryche by thy degre.'

[3] Besides the references quoted above the following may be cited: *Select Pleas of the Forest*, 19, 35 (men of the parsons of Easton and Irchester—1255); *Select Pleas in Manorial Courts*, 82 (servant of the rector of Little Stukely—1294); *Leet Jurisdiction in the City of Norwich*, 11 (servant of the parson of Pulham—1287–8); *Cal. Pat. Rolls, Edw. III*, Vol. VIII. 319 (John Clerc, 'Vikerservant de Wrangill'—1349); *Halmota Prioratus Dunelmensis*, 27 (William the Chaplain's maid—1361).

[4] The early episcopal records of Lincoln frequently mention the vicar's horse. *Lib. Ant.* 7, 'Eciam habebit fenum et prebendam ad equum unum de prioratu' (Bicester); *ibid.* 35, 'Canonici autem invenient ei palefridum ad sinodum ad capitula et ad infirmos cum fuerit necesse' (Ashby); *Rot. H. de Welles*, II. 275, 'Habebit etiam foragium ad palefridum suum et prebendam cum ierit ad sinodum et capitula' (Breedon); *ibid.* 297, 'et habebit palefridum suum ad fenum, forragium et avenam' (Swinford); *Rot. R. Grosseteste*, 29 'habebit etiam dictus vicarius equum suum ad prebendam et foragium dicte domus' (Bourne); *ibid.* 49, 'erit etiam palefridus dicti vicarii ad foragium et prebendam dictorum Abbatis et conventus cum ad capitulum vel negotia eorum proficiscatur' (Humberstone).

[5] Richard de Bury, *Philobiblon*, 31, 176: and see other references cited below.

if lawless, huntsmen—with, possibly, a clerk or two for company. More probably than a clerk he had another fireside companion, his wife, or as the constitutions disdainfully term her, his concubine.[1] That more or less regular unions on the part of the secular clergy were very frequent throughout the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries admits of no disbelief. Ecclesiastical enactment is borne out by satire, and satire by the evidence of episcopal registers and by those numerous casual references to sons and daughters of priests and other clerks, which shew how completely as a matter of course such issue was regarded.[2] From Robert of Brunne and from Richard de Bury some idea of the unblest household can be formed. Robert of Brunne's tale is of a right amorous priest (as he calls him), who, for the greater part of his life, kept a wife and at no time was separated from her, so sweet was his sin to him. There were four children of the union, who, as they grew up, were sent to school and in due course themselves became priests. After all four had been ordained first their father died and then their mother. On the mother's death the four sons kept watch by the body but, nevertheless, despite what they could do, it was carried off by devils. The youngest son, who, we are told, was the best and most diligent scholar of the four, for his mother's sake preached the piteous tale of her fate throughout England, declaiming everywhere against women whom priests take to wife, so that no woman might fall into that sin.[3] Richard de Bury gives us a less favourable picture of the parson's wife. Books are complaining that their place in the homes of the clergy is

'seized now by dogs, now by hawks, now by that biped beast whose cohabitation with the clergy was forbidden of old, from which we have always taught our nurslings to flee more than from the asp and cockatrice; wherefore she, always jealous of the

[1] 'Focaria,' of course, was another common term: *cf.* Wilkins, I. 573, 'De focariis amovendis.'

[2] H. C. Lea, *History of Sacerdotal Celibacy*, I. 328–359. See also Appendix I. to this paper, in which are collected a number of references more particularly concerning the parish clergy.

[3] *Handlyng Synne*, ll. 7981 seq.: the date of the poem is 1303.

love of us, and never to be appeased, at length seeing us in some corner protected only by the web of some dead spider, with a frown abuses and reviles us with bitter words, declaring us alone of all the furniture in the house to be unnecessary, and complaining that we are useless for any household purpose, and advises that we should speedily be converted into rich caps, sendal and silk and twice-dyed purple, robes and furs, wool and linen.' [1]

From the 'Reeve's Tale' can be gathered in what manner a married parson was regarded by his parishioners towards the end of the fourteenth century and the social position occupied by his daughter. She is married to the miller of Trumpington, one of the wealthiest, if not the wealthiest of the village craftsmen. She has been heavily dowered by the parson, and it is his purpose also to leave what he can of the goods of his church to the granddaughter. The satire is of course directed against parson as well as miller, but this very fact is testimony to its essential verisimilitude.[2]

With the worldly parson of Trumpington there is naturally contrasted a certain poor parson of a town who heard the story as it was first told on the road to Canterbury; and it is natural to contrast them as well as regards their material possessions as their spiritual gifts—although, their portraits

[1] *Philobiblon*, 31, 32, (or translated) 176, 177.

[2] 'The Reves Tale': *Canterbury Tales*, A., ll. 3942–3986:

'A wyf he hadde, y-comen of noble kin;
The person of the toun hir fader was.
With hir he yaf ful many a panne of bras,
For that Simkin sholde in his blood allye.
. . . . . .
A doghter hadde they bitwixe hem two
. . . . . .
The person of the toun, for she was feir,
In purpos was to maken hir his heir
Bothe of his catel and his messuage,
And straunge he made it of hir mariage.
His purpos was for to bistowe hir hye
In-to som worthy blood of auncetrye;
For holy chirches good moot been despended
On holy chirches blood, that is descended,
Therfore he wolde his holy blood honoure,
Though that he holy chirche sholde devoure.'

being but sketched, we know very little about either. But very real contrasts—such as may indeed have been in Chaucer's mind—are presented by any comparative account of the incomes of the parish clergy, such as that afforded by the 'Liber Antiquus' or the 'Taxatio.'[1] Leaving aside, however, for the moment, differences in the amount of their income, it is to be remarked that as regards the sources of income most parochial incumbents were in the same position in that they were dependent upon their glebe, their tithes and various customary offerings. Vicars, indeed, were frequently left with only part of the tithes, with certain specified fees, with but a fraction of the glebe; sometimes they received little more than a fixed stipend and their board and lodging.[2] In the case of some town parishes offerings and the tithes of craftsmen and traders may have been of chief importance;[3] but in the vast majority of

[1] Of 134 instances in the *Liber Antiquus*, in fifty the vicar's income is under five marks, in sixty-three from five to six marks, in twenty-one over six marks. The incomes range from three marks to £11 1*s*. 6*d*. and over in the case of St. John the Baptist, Peterborough (*Lib. Ant.* 31). Practically every page of the *Taxatio* will afford a similar contrast. For instance in the deanery of Middlesex (pp. 17, 18) there were forty-five churches (excluding three appropriated churches, one worth four, and two, three marks) varying in value between six and seventy marks: seven were worth fifty marks or over, six, thirty marks or over, twelve, twenty marks or over; twenty were worth less than twenty marks, and of these twelve were less than ten marks. There were besides twelve vicarages varying between six and a half and twelve marks.

[2] E.g. *Lib. Ant.* 1, 2, 'Ordinacio generalis super vicariis de Osen' . . . Vicarius . . . habebit nomine perpetue vicarie sue ad vestitum suum duas marcas per annum: habebit etiam secundum legatum ad valenciam sex denariorum et quod ultra sex denarios fuerit inter ipsum et canonicos dimidiabitur. Habebit eciam de oblacionibus ad altare provenientibus unum denarium missalem quocies celebraverit et denarius provenerit et quicquid ex devocioni fidelium ei racionabiliter fuerit collatum. Item habebit sufficientem exhibicionem sicut canonici quoad victualia in mensa canonicorum. . . .' Cf. *Rot. H. de Welles*, III. 25, quoted below.

[3] E.g. *Rot. R. Grosseteste*, 113, 'Consistit autem dicta vicaria in exhibitione capellani, qui debet accipere panem monichalem et cervisiam, cum generali de coquina, et ad palefridum necessaria in avena et foragio, et in decimis operariorum et omnium mercatorum ville Spalding, cum legatis capellano debitis et visitationibus infirmorum, cum denariis missalibus, et denariis cum pane benedicto oblatis, et caseis ad Pentecosten, et gallinis ad Natale ecclesie debitis.' The Vicar of St. John the Baptist,

parishes rector or vicar had to look to agriculture for his income, to his glebe and to his tithes 'of apples, of trees, of herbes, of pastures, of beastes, of wolle, of mylke, of heye'—as the enumeration of tithable things runs in an early fifteenth-century author.[1]

Peterborough, gets 'tertia pars decimarum mercatorum,' which together with 'tertia pars oblacionum in quibus sacrista non participiat' is worth four marks a year (*Lib. Ant.* 31). At Wycombe 'tota decima caɪdorum qui ad officium fullonum pertinent tam infra Burgum quam extra' is important enough to be mentioned but is apparently reserved to the appropriators (*ibid.* 17). The Vicar of Awre gets 'omnes decimas minores, exceptis decimis mercatorum mare transeuncium' (*Reg. J. de Trillek*, 243). The Vicar of Uttoxeter is to take amongst other dues, 'decimas quadragesimales ut de . . . lucro mercatorum . . . et decimas operariorum': *Reg. R. de Norbury*, 257. On a composition between the Abbot and Convent of Keynsham and the vicar of the parish to the latter are allotted 'all tithes of merchandise and handicrafts' (*Reg. H. Bowett*, 46).

[1] *Dives and Pauper, Seventh Commandment*, Chapter XIII. (edition 1536, f. 257 recto): the list continues 'of fysshynge, of fermes, of mylles, of bathes, of fyllynge places, of mynes of syluer and other metall, of quarreys of stone, of marchandyse, of crafte, and of other goodes, and also of tyme.' As to the date of the book see the present writer's article in *Notes and Queries*, 11 S. IV. 321.

The following examples are fairly typical of the provision made for a vicar's income. *Lib. Ant.* 5, '. . . . in toto altaragio et in dimidia virgata terre cum prato ad dictam ecclesiam pertinente et in manso cum crofta in quo capellanus ejusdem ecclesie manere consuevit et in decimis feni de toto villenagio et in decimis molendinorum et unius virgate terre quam dicti canonici de terra ejusdem ecclesie tenent' (Burton Abbots). *Rot. R. Grosseteste*, 146, '. . . . in toto altaragio et in sex marcis decimarum majorum, assignatarum in locis certis subscriptis: Item in duabus bovatis terre cum pertinentiis qua Willelmus de Avalon tenuit; et habebit vicarius mansum competentem . . .' (Haxey). *Reg. R. Baldock*, 99, '. . . vicarius . . . mansum habeat . . . et percipiat decimas ortorum et curtilagiorum et omnimodas decimas preter decimas garbarum feni et molendini ad ventum. Item, quod habeat omnimodas oblaciones, obvenciones et legata quecumque ipsi ecclesie vel ejus intuitu relicta ac cetera que cum corporibus mortuorum delate de jure vel consuetudine debeantur ecclesie ac omnia alia que ad altaragium noscuntur pertinere. Et preter hec ordinamus quod idem vicarius singulis annis habeat et percipiat a vobis abbate et conventu in festis sancti Michaelis et Pasche per equales porciones quinque marcas legalium sterlingorum de predictis decimis garbarum sibi per vos debite exsolvendas in augmentum porcionis supradicte . . .' (East Ham). *Rot. H. de Welles*, III. 25, 'Vicarius habebit nomine vicarie sue victum suum honorifice ad mensam Priorisse, et duas marcas annuas ad vestitum, et oblationes suas in majoribus solempnitatibus, sicut continetur in consimilibus vicariis. Habebit etiam fenum ad palefridum suum, et, cum ierit in utilitates domus et ad sinodum et capitula, prebendam. Item

The glebe lands of a parish do not appear to have lain together in a consolidated holding, save perhaps in rare instances.[1] Until the middle of the nineteenth century there were still a number of parishes in which the glebe lay scattered over the common fields, and from the tithe maps of uninclosed parishes a fair picture may be drawn of the conditions obtaining in a mediaeval parish. When, for example, the tithes of the parish of Runton were commuted, the rector held nineteen and a half acres of glebe, twelve acres of which were in strips, some apparently consolidated from smaller strips. The rectorial glebe of Beeston Regis lying in the same parish was similarly distributed over the common fields.[2] In the township of Sutton in Castor parish

habebit mansum competentem in prioratu vel extra, prout Episcopo visum fuerit; ubi, cum necesse fuerit, parrochiani sui ad ipsum libere possint accedere . . .' (Harrold).

[1] Possibly in the Exeter diocese the glebe may in some cases have consisted entirely of closes. The Vicarage of St. Sithney, for example, is endowed with 'duabus campis sitis inter campum Stulti, presbiteri, et regiam viam' (*Reg. W. Bronescombe*, 178). Similarly the lands of the vicarage of Staverton are set out as 'unum pratum vocatum Pollismeede et le Moore; unum clausum vocatum le Lee, continens per estimacionem quatuor terre acras; et unum clausum vocatum Maglond, continens per estimacionem quatuor terre acras' (*ibid.* 262). In the Exeter diocese the agricultural conditions were, however, probably abnormal.

[2] The Runton title apportionment is dated the 12th June, 1841. The details relating to the rectorial glebe of Runton are as follows:—

No. on plan.	Name and Description.	State of Cultivation.	Quantities.		
			a.	*r.*	*p.*
3	Marl Pit Land	Arable		2	10
8	,, ,, ,, ...	,,		3	29
10	Church Close	,,	2	3	24
15	Church Pightle	,,		3	5
23	Land.	,,			31
40	Womans Hithe Land . . .	,,	1	1	21
47	Land.	,,		3	32
52	Barren Land	,,		1	2
53	Land.	,,	1	3	33
55	New Pightle	,,	2	0	18
75	Land.	,,		3	34
88	,, ...	,,		2	3
92	,, ...	,,		2	2
333	Old Close	,,	3	0	18
380	Land in White Ollands . .	,,		2	16
381	,, ,, ,, . .	,,		1	5
382	,, ,, ,, . .	,,		2	16

the process of consolidation had gone further at the time of the tithe commutation than at Runton, but the same general features are to be observed and the larger holdings are obviously composed of several consolidated acre or half-acre strips.[1] When, in the thirteenth and fourteenth cen-

The details relating to the rectorial glebe of Beeston Regis are as follows :

No. on plan.	Name and Description.	State of Cultivation.	Quantities.		
			a.	*r.*	*p.*
6	Marl Pit Land	Arable	2	1	6
17	Barn and Stable	Pasture			29
20	Pond Piece	Arable	2	2	3
27	Land	Pasture			15
28	Scald Land	Arable		3	24
31	Swine's Snout	Pasture			8
34	Scald	Arable		3	32
36	Land	,,	1	3	22
38	,,	,,			35
41	Narrows	Pasture		1	3
54	Land	Arable	2	1	18
61	,,	,,		1	24
66	,,	,,		2	6
70	,,	,,		1	8
79	,,	,,	1	0	15
86	,,	,,		2	18
96	,,	,,		1	2
97	,,	,,		2	26
103	Pothill Land	,,		1	37
112	Great Wood Land	,,		3	11
334	The Patch	,,			17
344	West Cross Land	,,	1	0	2

[1] The apportionment for the township of Sutton is dated the 28th August, 1848. The details relating to the rectorial glebe are as follows :—

No. on plan.	Name and Description.	State of Cultivation.	Quantities.		
			a.	*r.*	*p.*
4	Five Acre Close	Arable	3	3	15
70	In North Field	,,	3	2	26
84	,, ,,	,,		3	15
100*a*	In Middle Field	,,		2	39
112	,, ,,	,,	4	3	34
123	Meadow Field	,,	1	3	30
131	,, ,,	,,	2	0	8
138	,, ,,	,,	1	3	9
157	The Meadow	Pasture		3	31
161	,, ,,	,,	1	1	18

The apportionment for the parish of Castor and Ailsworth (dated the 30th September, 1847) illustrates the same features of mediaeval survivals

turies, the glebe is mentioned it is frequently referred to merely as 'terra ecclesie,'[1] 'terra ad ecclesiam pertinens,'[2] 'terra dominica,'[3] 'terra Sanctuarii,'[4] but there are also more detailed descriptions which leave no room for doubt that the conditions obtaining in uninclosed parishes of modern times are survivals from the Middle Ages. The glebe is described in terms sometimes of hides,[5] sometimes of virgates,[6] sometimes of bovates,[7] sometimes of

as the apportionments of Runton and Sutton, but on a larger scale. The rectorial glebe is 156*a*. 1*r*. 21*p*. in extent and is composed of 7 closes with a total area of about 34 acres and 161 strips of which 131 are described as arable, 24 as pasture and 6 as arable and pasture. Of these 43 are approximately ¼ acre in extent, 44 approximately ½ acre, 34 approximately ¾ acre, 37 approximately one acre: the remaining three are 2, 2¾ and 5 acres respectively. The strips are scattered over Wood Field (16), Nether Field (6), Nomangate Field (6), East Holms Field (6), Cale Meadow (10), Mill Field (33), Thorn Field (34) and Milton Field (50).

See also the apportionments for Hildersham, Cambs., September 24, 1840 (rectorial glebe), Shinfield, Berks., December 31, 1841 (vicarial and appropriate glebe), Portland, Dorset, September 30, 1842 (rectorial glebe), Upton St. Leonard's, Gloucester, December 31, 1842 (appropriate glebe), Steventon, Berks., 11 March, 1844 (appropriate glebe), which all shew glebe lying in strips in the common fields.

[1] E.g. *Rot. H. de Welles*, I. 2 (Westone).

[2] *Ibid.* III. 47, 'tota libera terra ad dictam ecclesiam pertinente' (Flamstead).

[3] *Ibid.* I. 154, 'tota terra dominica' (Careby).

[4] *Reg. W. Bronescombe*, 104, 'terra Sanctuarii' (Hennock). *Ibid.* 171, 'cum Sanctuario, excepto homagio' (St. Feock).

[5] 'Dimidia hida terre': *Lib. Ant.* 2 and 82 (Great Barton); *ibid.* 8 (Stoke Lyne); *Rot. H. de Welles*, I. 183 (North Aston); *ibid.* II. 2 (Pyrton).

[6] Three virgates: *Lib. Ant.* 35 (Patishall); *Rot. R. Grosseteste*, 217 (Wardley); *Reg. R. Shrewsbury*, 280 (Henton). Two virgates and a half: *Lib. Ant.* 3 (Duns Tew). Two virgates: *ibid.* 3 (Cassington); *ibid.* 7 (Wroxton); *ibid.* 13 (Stantonbury); *Rot. H. de Welles*, I. 36 (Thornton), 203 (Wilbarston); *Rot. R. Grosseteste*, 199 (Whitfield). One virgate and a half: *Lib. Ant.* 89 (Stokes); *Reg. R. Shrewsbury*, 720 (East Cammell). One virgate: *Lib. Ant.* 6 (Shipton); *ibid.* 16 (Heddenham); *ibid.* 24 (Stagsden); *ibid.* 33 (Ashby; Hardingstone); *ibid.* 36 (Marston); *Rot. H. de Welles*, I. 4 (Tingrith); *ibid.* III. 19 (Salford); *Reg. R. de Swinfield*, 458 (Bold). Half virgate: *Lib. Ant.* 5 (Burton); *ibid.* 13 (Bradwell); *ibid.* 18 (Upton); *ibid.* 32 (Wellingborough); *Rot. H. de Welles*, II. 2 (Pyrton); *ibid.* II. 40 (Coggs).

[7] Bovates: four, *Rot. H. de Welles*, I. 150 (Barnetby); three and a half, *Lib. Ant.* 65 (Cabourn); three, *ibid.* 92 (Cameringham); two, *ibid.* 54 (Leasingham), 69 (Messingham); *Rot. R. Grosseteste*, 146 (Haxey); *Reg. R. de Norbury*, 267; one, *Lib. Ant.* 56 (Dirrington).

acres,[1] and now and then strips and butts are mentioned.[2] At times the manner in which the glebe is disposed over the parish is set forth, and it is most clearly to be seen that the land was scattered over the open fields like any peasant's holding. At Coggs, for example, the vicar had a half virgate, five acres of which lay at the cross towards the house of Robert de Rothomago, two and a half at the road next the croft of Henry Pincun, and two and a half next the croft of Roger le Noreis: the vicar had besides two acres of meadow in Grimesmede between Coggs mill and le Flemeng' meadow.[3] At Stoke Bliss the vicar had a piece of land called 'la Pyrie,' three acres of 'Doriebrugges' field, three acres in 'Sakhulle' field, three acres and a half acre in 'Grethulle' field, three acres at Coumbe extending up to John de Bleys' meadow, one acre beyond Coumbe lying towards the hill, one acre at Wessbroke, one acre called 'Stapilacre,' three strips at

[1] Acres: sixty, *Reg. A. de Orleton*, 203 (Avenbury); twenty-three, *Lib. Ant.* 31 (Peterborough); twenty, *Reg. W. Bronescombe*, 35 (Brampford Speke); twelve, *ibid.* 40 (Buckland Brewer), *Lib. Ant.* 36 (Evenley); ten, *ibid.* 12 (Brickhill); nine and a half, *Reg. R. Shrewsbury*, 341 (Northover); seven, *Lib. Ant.* 18 (Stoke Pogis); six, *ibid.* 56 (Canwick), 3 (North Aston); five, *Rot. R. Grosseteste*, 181 (King's Cliffe), *Reg. R. Shrewsbury*, 510 (West Harptree); four and a half, *Rot. H. de Welles*, II. 21 (Sandford); four, *Lib. Ant.* 49 (Burton); three, *Reg. R. de Swinfield*, 492 (Lyonshall). Cf. *A Suffolk Hundred in the Year* 1283, which contains a Return as to Land Tenure in the Hundred of Blackbourne made in 1280 (see p. 2). The endowments of the churches are stated and are as follows:—eighty acres, p. 19 (Stowe Langetot); sixty, p. 37 (Trostone); fifty, p. 27 (Hoptone); forty, p. 43 (Hunegheton); thirty-six, p. 6 (Langham); thirty, p. 22 (Hildircle), 26 (Rikynghale), 34 (Coleforde), 65 (Westowe); twenty-nine, p. 43 (Wridewell); twenty-six, p. 25 (Conegestone); twelve, p. 22 (Elmeswelle); ten, p. 36 (Ingham), 48 (Stanton).

[2] *Rot. R. Grosseteste*, 40, 'quinque sellionibus terre in Hundeleby'; *ibid.* 125, 'uno sellione jacente ad Thoresholm' (Covenham); *Reg. R. de Swinfield*, 391, 'tres selliones apud Sceldregge.' *Rot. H. de Welles*, I. 47, 'terra que vocatur Buttas inter Bilawella et Guldiche' (Haseley); 36, 'cum illo mesuagio quod Gilebertus quondam tenuit cum crofto adjacente quod continet XI selliones et V buttos . . .' (Thornton).

[3] *Rot. H. de Welles*, II. 40, 'cujus dimidie virgate quinque acre jacent ad crucem versus domum Roberti de Rothomago, et due acre et dimidia ad viam juxta croftum Henrici Pincun, et due acre et dimidia juxta croftum Rogeri le Noreis, et due acre prati in Grimesmede inter molendinum de Koges et pratum le Flemeng.' . . .

Sceldregge, and four acres lying towards the highway; he had also a meadow and half a field called 'Reddinge.'[1] Even where the glebe was of very small extent it appears to have been scattered. The Vicar of Stevington, for instance, had one acre of meadow next a spring in one place, and elsewhere half an acre called 'le holm'; he had also one acre of land called St. Nicholas' acre, and three roods in the adjoining fields.[2] In many cases a vicar had only two acres of glebe, but these are frequently described as lying one in one field and the other in the other.[3] As with arable

[1] *Reg. R. de Swinfield*, 391, 'Item idem vicarius habebit terram de la Pyrie cum omnibus pertinenciis que ad octo solidos estimatur. Item habebit tres acras de Doriebruggesfeld que ad novem denarios similiter estimantur. Item habebit tres acras in campo de Sakhulle que ad novem denarios similiter estimantur. Item habebit tres acras cum dimidia in campo de Grethulle que ad novem denarios similiter estimantur. Item habebit quoddam pratum jacens juxta iter de feodo Hugonis Bleys quod ad duodecim denarios estimatur. Item habebit tres acras apud Coumbe extendentes se ad pratum Johannis de Bleys que ad septem denarios et obolum estimantur. Item habebit unam acram super Coumbe extendentem se versus collem que ad duos denarios et obolum estimatur. Item habebit unam acram apud Wessbroke que ad duos denarios et obolum similiter estimatur. Item habebit unam acram que vocatur Stapilacre que ad duos denarios et obolum estimatur. Item habebit tres selliones apud Sceldregge qui ad duos denarios et obolum estimantur. Item habebit quatuor acras extendentes versus iter regium que ad decem denarios et obolum estimantur. Item habebit medietatem campi de Reddinge versus North se extendentes cum pertinenciis que ad duodecim denarios estimatur.'

[2] *Rot. H. de Welles*, III. 15, 'unam acram prati juxta fontem in uno loco, et alibi dimidiam que dicitur le holm. Item habebit unam acram terre que vocatur acra Sancti Nicholai, et tres rodas in campis juxta eandem acram.' Cf. *Lib. Ant.* 18, 'septem acris de terra ecclesie de quibus tres jacent juxta stagnum domini ubi capellani habitare solebant et due in Wurde et due in Apelton. Consistit eciam in tota canonicorum terra cum pertinenciis suis que jacet inter dominicum domini versus aquilonem et moram . . .' (Stoke Pogis). *Ibid.* 3, 'sex acris terre jacentibus juxta Caldewell in campo orientali' (North Aston). *Reg. P. Quivil*, 339, 'tota illa terra de Sanctuario . . . que jacet extra clausum ex parte Australi supradicte Ecclesie, inter terras Abbatis et Conventus de Dunkewille.'

[3] E.g. *Lib. Ant.* 9 (Shiplake; Goring), 'una acra in uno campo et alia in alio campo.' *Ibid.* 13 (Caversfield), 15 (Great Kimble), 'duabus acris terre una scilicet in uno campo et alia in alio.' *Ibid.* 12 (Woolston), 'una acra terre in utroque campo apud Woleston.' Sometimes the vicar had only one acre: e.g. *Rot. H. de Welles*, I. 181, 'una acra terre arabilis' (Elsfield).

land, so in many of the instances where meadow is mentioned it is evident that the holding lay in the common meadow, and it would appear that where meadow land was distributed by lot the glebe share was allotted precisely as were the shares of ordinary members of the village community.[1]

Besides his strips in the common fields the rector or vicar might have a close under pasture[2] and in all cases was likely to have a right of common of pasture[3] over the waste, as well as such other rights of common—estovers,

[1] *Lib. Ant.* 50, ' quinque acris prati spectantibus ad eandem ecclesiam in pratis de Otoft ' (Calceby) ; *Rot. H. de Welles*, I. 74, ' quatuor acras prati in prato de Brantona ' (Godmanchester) ; *ibid.* II. 40 (Coggs—quoted above) ; *ibid.* III. 15 (Stevington—quoted above) ; *Rot. R. Grosseteste*, 125, ' quatuor acris prati et dimidia, quarum tres jacent in pratis de Germiredesthorp et in Honedayles, et una acra et dimidia jacente in Cunninghenges in parochia de Fulestowa, et est totum pratum quolibet anno falcandum ' (Covenham). There appears to be a direct reference to the custom of distributing shares in the meadow by lot in *Lib. Ant.* 17, ' dimidia acra prati in Cherlemed, secundum fors singulis annis eandem contulerit ' (Medmenham). A reference to a share in common meadows is possibly hidden under such phrases as ' duabus virgatis terre cum prato adjacente ' (*Lib. Ant.* 3—Cassington), which are frequently to be found : cf. *Rot. R. Grosseteste*, 217 (Wardley), *Reg. R. de Swinfield*, 458 (Bold), *Reg. J. de Trillek*, 243 (Awre). Such quantities as ' una acra prati ' (*Lib. Ant.* 12—Little Brickhill) can hardly have been elsewhere than in the common meadow. Cf. *Suffolk Hundred*, 19, ' iij rodis prati ' (Stowe Langetot), 26, ' una acra prati ' (Rikynghale), *Reg. R. Shrewsbury*, 341, ' two acres of meadow for one year, and another year two acres of meadow, except a fourth ' (Northover).

[2] *Rot. R. Grosseteste*, 136, ' pratum quod jacet juxta toftum Hellewise vidue ' (Risby), 99, ' parvo pratello ' (Louth). *Reg. R. de Swinfield*, 391 (Stoke Bliss—quoted above), 492, ' illa pastura que vocatur Personescroft ' (Lyonshall).

[3] *Lib. Ant.* 14, ' habebit autem vicarius quatuor vaccas et xxiiij^{or} oves in pastura canonicorum ' (Worminghall), 33, ' habebit communam pasture quanta pertinet ad unam virgatam terre ' (Preston). *Reg. R. Baldock*, 91, ' habeat et possideat omnimodas terras, prata, pascua et pasturas spectantes ad dictam ecclesiam de Yllinges una cum quarta parte bosci ecclesie ejusdem ' (Ealing). *Reg. J. de Trillek*, 243, ' omnibus pratis et pasturis tam inter clausum quam extra ad ecclesiam pertinentibus ' (Awre). *Cf.* case reported in *Reg. R. de Swinfield*, 290 *seq.* : Galfridus, persona ecclesie de Wetenovere, and others, claim rights of common over the bishop's lands at Easthampton : in the course of the action Galfridus relinquishes his claim (*ibid.* 293).

perhaps, or turbary [1]—as the character of the locality might determine. Sometimes, too, he had an orchard [2] as part of his glebe, and we may, in fact, expect to find rectors and vicars in possession of every form of agricultural property known to the Middle Ages.

It is probable that besides being landowners the great majority of the rectors and vicars of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries were also agriculturists. There is evidence, it is true, pointing to the conclusion that certain of the clergy did not themselves cultivate at least some part of the lands of their churches and that they derived part of their income from tenants who performed services or paid rents.[3] But on the other hand there is evidence, if such be

[1] *Lib. Ant.* 66, 'cum pratis pascuis et pasturis et turbariis' (Alford), 87, 'libertatibus suis in pratis pascuis pasturis et turbariis' (Billingborough). *Rot. H. de Welles*, II. 2, 'cum . . . husbote et heibote in bosco eorum, et in omnibus libertatibus communibus' (Pyrton).

[2] *Lib. Ant.* 3, 'cum domibus, orto et pomario . . . ad ecclesiam pertinentibus' (Cassington). *Rot. H. de Welles*, I. 61, 'quodam tofto cum orto et pomario ipsi tofto adjacentibus' (Bassingham). *Rot. R. Grosseteste*, 197 'quadam parte tofti de illa, scilicet, que vocatur oriens pomerium.' *Reg. A. de Orleton*, 203, 'orto pomifero superiori . . . cum adjacente sibi curtilagio seu herbario' (Avenbury).

[3] *Lib. Ant.* 3, 'quatuor cotariis reddentibus quatuor solidis' (Coggs); 33, 'terram ecclesie in dominico et serviciis que valent per annum ad minus sedecim solidos' (Brayfield). *Rot. H. de Welles*, I. 99, 'cum terra spectante ad capellam de Cassinthorpa, et in viginti et octo solidis quos vicarius singulis annis percipiet de redditu assise in eadem villa' (Barrowby); 137, 'in redditu quatuor solidorum de terra ipsius ecclesie' (Evington); 148, 'redditu trium et triginta solidorum et quatuor denariorum, quem homines tenentes terram ecclesie solvunt annuatim ipsi ecclesie' (Kirtlington); III. 47, 'tota libera terra ad dictam ecclesiam pertinente, cum manso quem precedens vicarius habuit; salvis persone ejusdem ecclesie terris et redditibus hominum de eadem ecclesia tenentium' (Flamstead). *Rot. R. Grosseteste*, 195, 'tribus marcis annui redditus provenientibus de hominibus persone in eadem villa percipiendis per manum ipsius rectoris vel ejus certi procuratoris terminis statutis' (Chipping Warden). *Reg. R. de Swinfield*, 134, 'duos solidos et quatuor denarios de redditu assise per annum quem debet Willelmus de Ponte de Cliftone pro terra quam tenet de ecclesia de Cliftone' (Clifton). *Reg. P. Quivil*, 339, 'toto redditu assise tam cotteriorum quam aliorum de Sanctuario . . . terram tenencium.' *Suffolk Hundred*, 26, 'xxx acris terre i acra prati v solidis annualis redditus quas Rector . . . . tenet.' The term 'tota libera terra' in the

needed, of the glebe being actually in the hands of the incumbent [1] and there are also a number of instances in which parish clergy, both beneficed and unbeneficed, are found holding—either on lease or otherwise—land other than glebe.[2] The fact, too, that rectors, vicars and chaplains

case of Flamstead is probably explained by the following extract from the ordinance of the vicarage of Cabourn, *Lib. Ant.* 65, 'in tribus bovatis terre et dimidia ex una parte ville et tribus bovatis et dimidia ex alia cum omnibus earum pertinenciis liberis ab omni seculari exactione. . . .' As to services see *Rot. H. de Welles*, I. 47, 'terra quam Rogerus vis [*sic*] de Leu tenuit de Roberto persona de Heseleya, et in terris quas Walterus Wuderover et Hugo filius Serlonis et Osbertus carpentarius et Agnes cancellaria tenuerunt de eodem Roberto . . . cum pertinentiis et serviciis ad dictas terras spectantibus' (Haseley); 77, 'tenemento Willelmi Monachi et Thurberni et Hugonis Sutoris cum servitiis eorundem' (Turvey: mediety). Cf. *ibid.* 95, 'terra quam Ricardus Maufrais tenuit de W., quondam persona dicte ecclesie' (Stoke: mediety). *Suffolk Hundred*, 36, 'Abbas Sancti Edmundi habet aduocacionem ecclesie de Ingham que dotatur i acra terre arabilis, item de ix acris terre arabilis quam villani dicte ecclesie tenent cum suis messuagiis.'

[1] *Suffolk Hundred*, 6, 'Abbas de Sancto Edmundo est aduocatus ecclesie de Langham que dotata est xxxvj acris terre quas Rector ecclesie Nicholaus de Becklis tenet'; 19, 'Aduocatio ecclesie de Stowe Langetot pertinet ad Reginaldum Pecche que dotatur iiii^{xx} acris terre arabilis iij rodis prati quas Rector ecclesie Thomas de Pakenham tenet in manu sua'; see also *ibid.* 22, 25, 26, 27. *Reg. R. de Swinfield*, 134, 'item terram quam Alexander, capellanus, tenuit in parochia capelle de parva Stanford' (Clifton).

[2] *Rot. H. de Welles*, I. 214, 'decima octo bovatarum terre, de quibus Walterus de Marisco tenet quatuor, Hugo presbiter unam . . .' (Cotes). *Reg. W. Bronescombe*, 22: the rector of St. Columb Major leases from the bishop 'totam terram nostram de Arwennech, cum omnibus pertinenciis, ad terminum vite sue, et communem pasturam in wasto nostro': the rent is 30*s.* and the rector is to do suit at the Bishop's court at Penryn. *Ibid.* 178, 'campum Stulti presbiteri' (St. Sithney). *Reg. Th. de Cantilupo*, 170, 'totam terram quam Rogerus de Mimede, capellanus, tenuit . . . in manerio nostro de Lydebury North.' See *ibid.* 44, from which it appears that the minor clergy too hold land, in this case, apparently, part of the glebe: 'Item ordinamus quod vicarius et successores sui habeant pratum . . . dictis domibus annexum; et pratum diaconi sive campanarii suo prato annexum cum certis terris arabilibus nuper in manibus diaconi sive campanarii, quod pratum et terre fuerunt pratum et terre diaconi sive campanarii.' *Suffolk Hundred*, 18, 'Radulphus Capellanus tenet . . . 1 messuagium iij rodas terre per seruicium ij d. . . .'; 27, 'Johannes Capellanus de Prate tenet i messuagium xvj acras terre arabilis videlicet messuagium predictum de Matheo de Louayne per servicium iiij d. et xvj

are frequently mentioned in the assessments for lay subsidies of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries is in itself evidence that they frequently cultivated land not held in right of the church.[1]

As a natural consequence of their position as members of the village agricultural community the parish clergy are

acras terre predicte de Hugone de Cressyngham per seruicium v. s. . . .' : cf. *ibid.* 34, 40, 51, 57, 62, 63. *Select Pleas of the Forest*, xlix, ' Johannes Wardu et Willelmus Wardu, vicarius ecclesie de Bodyham, ocupauerunt quamdam porcionem terre de solo domini regis vocatam Calkeleghes in Leyefeld' continentem per estimacionem triginta acras terre.' *Select Pleas in Manorial Courts*, 125, ' Mortuo Willelmo filio Bartholomei le Carpenter de Kinges Ripton' capellano qui tenuit in eadem villa per descensum hereditatis secundum consuetudinem manerii iij. acras terre . . .' ; 126, ' Rogerus . . . venit et petit in curia . . . illas vj. acras terre jacentes in campis de Kinges Ripton' quas quidem terras Willelmus filius Bartholomei le Carpenter capellanus modo mortuus perquisivit et eas de domino tenuit secundum consuetudinem manerii . . .' (in 1301). *Court Baron*, 138, ' Robertus le Cartere queritur de . . . Thoma Thame capellano [and others] de placito quare deforciant ei quandam peciam prati (continentem j. rodam prout jacet) jacentem ad capud terre sue quam adquisivit de Albino Anke ' (1324). *Halmota Prioratus Dunelm.* 106, ' Adam del Vikers cepit medietatem terrarum et tenementorum villae de Suth-Pyttyngton nuper in tenura Johannis de Moreslawe : . . . et faciet in omnibus aliis sicut Willelmus Bati vicarius facit qui cepit alteram medietatem secundum quod continentur in indentura ipsius vicarii ' (1371). See *ibid.* 132, 180, 183, for other similar transactions to which other vicars are parties.

[1] *Rot. Parl.* I. 231 (Robert, Rector of Holy Trinity), 236 (Roger, Rector of St. Rumwald : John, Vicar of Coggeshall), 237 (William Fraunk, Vicar) ; these are from the Colchester assessment of 1296. *Ibid.* 256 (Rector of St. Peter), 258 (Robert de Porta, Chaplain), 259 (Rector of St. Rumwald), 261 (Rector of Tendryng) ; these are from the assessment of 1301. The Sussex Subsidy Rolls of 1296, 1327 and 1332 are similar in their inclusion of a considerable proportion of parish clergy : e.g. *Three Earliest Subsidies for the County of Sussex*, 27, 38, 68, 62, 85, 221, 328, (chaplains), 54, 59, 60, 65, 69, 71, 76, 85, 89, 165, 166, 168, 179, 190, 197, 241 (Rectors, Parsons and Vicars). See also Appendix to *Suffolk Hundred* in which Chaplains are mentioned under Berdewell, Berningham, Culeford, Hepporthe, Hoppetun, Ixcewrth, Livermere Parva, Stanton, Stowlangetot, Thorpe, Trostun and Westue. Lay subsidies only affected the clergy in so far as they possessed moveables which ' ne seient mie annex a leur Eglises ' (*Rot. Parl.* I. 239), and it appears from the Colchester and Suffolk assessments that the moveables taxed were grain of various kinds, stock farm animals and carts. Augmentation of benefices since 1291 may explain some instances of the inclusion of rectors and vicars in lay assessments. *Cf.* Willard, 219.

found suing and being sued in the manorial courts.[1] They do suit;[2] they are pledges;[3] they are amerced.[4] They appear in fact to have been treated precisely as any other tenant. The rector of Brightwaltham is even referred to as a villein, so closely had he become identified with the general body of suitors of the court.[5] As agriculturists too the parish clergy sold[6] and bought[7] and, to the scandal of those of stricter view and in face of the admonitions of the church,[8] some of the fourteenth-century parish clergy appear to have become traders on a considerable scale.

[1] E.g. *Halmota Prioratus Dunelm.* 150, 'Dies datus est Joh. de Heswell ad faciend. legem suam cum vj manu ad prox. cur., quod non debet Joh. de Galleway capellano xvj s. vj d. pro blad. quos ei solvisse debuit per ij an. elapsos ad damp. ipsius Joh. vj s. viij d.' (1378). *Select Pleas in Manorial Courts*, 173, 'Dominus Willelmus Capellanus vad' legem quod non deffamavit Henricum clavigerum domini imponendo ei crimina diversa. Et habet diem in proxima curia per sum' vj^ta manu capellanorum et clericorum' (1296). Cf. *Court Baron*, 105: *Halmota Prioratus Dunelm.* 2, 184.

[2] *Ibid.* 23, 'Henrico Drwet capellano pro defecto sectae cur'. . . .'

[3] *Ibid.* 132, 'Pleg. de firma et omnibus aliis . . . vicarius ecclesiae de Dalton.'

[4] *Select Pleas in Manorial Courts*, 89, 90 (Vicar of St. Ives). *Court Baron*, 131 ('quidam canis vicarii fug' sepius lepores in campo'), 132 ('Thomas Thame capellanus non paravit porcionem suam super calcetum'). Cf. *Halmota Prioratus Dunelm.* 98, 146, 150.

[5] *Select Pleas in Manorial Courts*, 164.

[6] *Halmota Prioratus Dunelm*, 150 (John de Galleway, chaplain, sells corn to John de Heswell). *Leet Jurisdiction in Norwich*, 14 (Robert, a parson, presented for having a false and unsealed measure of ale), 19 (Richard Grund, chaplain, accused of forestalling), 35, 42 (John de Ffransham, chaplain, accused of forestalling), 48 (John de Madelmarkette, chaplain), 65 (parson of Pakefeld accused of forestalling). Cf. *Social England in Fifteenth Century*, 103.

[7] *Halmota Prioratus Dunelm.* 80 (Richard de Heswell, chaplain). *Leet Jurisdiction in Norwich*, 63 (parsons of St. Katherine's and St. Margaret's).

[8] Gower, *Vox Clamantis*, III. cap. 19, 'Hic loquitur de rectoribus in curis residentibus, qui tamen curas animarum omittentes, quasi seculi mercatores singula temporalia de die in diem ementes et vendentes, mundi diuicias adquirunt.' Cf. *Mirour de l'Omme*, ll. 20305 ff.: Myrc, *Instructions to Parish Priests*, l. 38, 'And marchaundyse þow schalt not make': Wilkins, *Concilia*, II. 146, 'Inhibemus igitur cunctis clericis, religiosis et aliis, ne quis eorum negotiator existat, vel secularia commercia inhonesta maxima exercere praesumat. . . . Et quamquam clericis sit interdicta negotiatio, illa negotiationis species in ipsis prae caeteris detestatur ubi tempus venditur, quod omnibus est commune . . . Inhibemus etiam ipsis, ne vilius emant, ut carius vendant. . .' (Quivil's *Constitutions*, Cap. xxix., 1287).

Prestis [it was said] also ben marchauntis, as comunly as worldly men & more sotil & falsere, & leuen here gostly office; for þei ben corseris & makers of malt, & bien schep & neet & sellen hem for wynnynge, & beten marketis, & entermeten hem of louedaies. . . .[1]

And just as the country clergy followed the ordinary secular pursuits of the world around them, so the town clergy —if we may judge from the example of London—seem to have imitated the townsmen. At the beginning of the fourteenth century the London clergy formed a kind of gild, very similar apparently to the ordinary craft gild, with a special dress, officers, weekly contributions and corresponding benefits. One striking feature was a rule that if a chaplain, parish clerk or servant (*minister*) of any church deserted his rector on any malicious pretext he was not to be employed by any of the other *confederati* until he was reconciled,[2] and it may not perhaps be too fanciful to find in this rule a parallel to the various attempts of the master-craftsmen at a somewhat later date to coerce the journeymen who were striving to better their conditions.[3] We may, too, see a further parallel between clergy and craft gilds in the order made in 1382 by the Mayor, Aldermen and Common Council for restricting the fees of parsons of churches within the City.[4] In this latter respect, moreover, London did not stand alone.[5]

The question of the income of the parish clergy is a difficult one. Even were a rector's or vicar's income entirely derived from his benefice—and we have seen that it was frequently supplemented from lay sources—yet a statement of the value of that benefice would not in itself tell us much. It is frequently specifically stated that the income allotted

[1] *English Works of Wyclif*, 172, 'The Order of Priesthood,' cap. 13; this is not certainly by Wyclif.

[2] *Victoria County History: London*, I. 203.

[3] Ashley, *Economic History*, II. 101 *seq.*

[4] Riley, *Memorials*, 463.

[5] *Borough Customs*, II. 209 *seq.*

to a vicar had to provide for several clergy,[1] and a rector was necessarily in a similar position, more particularly since he was often not himself in priest's orders. Of course, the less the incumbent gave his assistant clergy the larger his own income ; and there was naturally a tendency for the incomes of the stipendiary chaplains—and presumably of clergy in minor orders—to be cut down.

> 'And if the parsoun have a prest of a clene lyf,
> That be a god consailler to maiden and to wif,
> Shall comen a daffe and putte him out for a litel lasse,
> That can noht a ferthing worth of god, unnethe singe a masse But ill.
> And thus shal al the parish for lac of lore spille.'[2]

Thus speaks a satirist of Edward II's reign, and the evil he bewails is evidently the reason for the repeated enactments before the Black Death aiming at securing a minimum wage for stipendiary chaplains and vicars.[3] The minimum was usually fixed at five marks, although Bishop Quivil in 1287 did not demand more from rectors than that they should give sixty shillings to parish priests and fifty shillings to assistant priests. This scale was fixed lest parish priests, to the dishonour of the clerical order, should be impelled to beg or to hanker after vile money-making employments or be driven to go about in indecent garb on account of their poverty. The terms of Bishop Quivil's Constitutions make it clear that it was quite usual to pay less than the amounts stipulated.[4] In the Chichester diocese about the

[1] E.g. *Lib. Ant.* 3, 'necessarii sunt ibi tres capellani' (Bradwell), 6, 'habebit vicarius capellanum socium in dicta parochia' (Shipton), 7, habebit capellanum secum socium . . . et inveniet clericum' (Wroxton)

[2] *Political Songs*, 328.

[3] Wilkins, *Concilia*, I. 587, 'Statuimus igitur ut perpetuo vicario ad minus quinque marcarum reditus assignetur . . .' (Concilium Oxoniense, 1222). *Ibid.* II. 147, 'statuimus ut in parochialibus ecclesiis quaelibet vicaria perpetua certas portiones habeat sibi assignatas, valentes ad minus pretium unius capellani stipendia quinque marcas. . . .' (Quivil's *Constitutions*, cap. xxviii, 1287).

[4] *Ibid.* 'Ad haec, ne parochiales sacerdotes in vituperium clericalis ordinis oporteat mendicare, aut turpis lucri quaestibus inhiare, seu in habitu indecenti incedere propter rerum inopiam compellantur; statuimus, ut

same time conditions must have been similar, and there was a danger lest on account of the slenderness of stipends the unworthy should be preferred to the worthy, the ignorant to the learned.[1]

Perpetual vicars probably had a higher average annual income than the mere stipendiary chaplains and assistant priests.[2] A great many vicars received, however, but five or six marks and even less a year,[3] and although rectorial incomes ruled higher yet there were some who must have been very badly off,[4] particularly if they endeavoured to dispense any measure of hospitality in addition to meeting the various claims that fell on an incumbent in respect of the maintenance of the church and its services and the fees demanded by the officers of the diocese. Vicars, of course, were also supposed to dispense hospitality, even from an income of five marks,[5]

a rectoribus ecclesiarum, quibus deserviunt annuatim, percipiant pro stipendiis lx solidos sterlingorum. Et si cum eisdem convenerint pro quantitate minori, praesentis tamen synodi auctoritate decrevimus suppleri quod deest. . . . Sacerdotes vero auxiliarii non minus percipiant quam quinquaginta solidos, quamquam cum eisdem conveniri contigerit pro minori. . . .' *Cf.* Thorold Rogers, *History of Agriculture*, ii. 576, where there are five instances of chaplains receiving 50*s.* a year, and one 46*s.* 2*d.*: these cases are all between 1263 and 1278.

[1] Wilkins, *Concilia*, II. 170 (1289), 'Ne propter levitatem stipendiorum viliores honestioribus, vel imperiti peritioribus praeferantur.'

[2] In the *Liber Antiquus*, of 134 recorded incomes, twenty-one are over six marks: in the deanery of Middlesex at the time of the *Taxatio* (pp. 17–18) there were twelve vicars receiving between six and a half and twelve marks. *Cf.* Thorold Rogers, *History of Agriculture*, II. 579, for instance of a chaplain receiving a stipend of 200*s.* (Langley—1324).

[3] The *Liber Antiquus* records fifty cases in which the vicar's income was under five marks (in some cases three only) and sixty-three cases of incomes from five to six marks.

[4] Fifty-five London rectors had less than two marks from the churches: *Victoria County History: London*, I. 193. Sixty rectors and vicars of Essex had livings valued at £3 13*s.* 4*d.* a year and under: *Victoria County History: Essex*, II. 11. For higher values see note 1 to p. 100 above. *Cf.* Wilkins, *Concilia*, I. 571, 'Ut nullus nisi sacerdos admittatur ad aliquam ecclesiam cujus aestimatio non excedat v marcas.'

[5] Wilkins, *Concilia*, II. 147. Bishop Quivil after fixing perpetual vicars' stipends at a minimum of five marks continues, 'de quibus ipse vicarius juxta suae substantiae modulum valeat hospitalitatem tenere.'

and there are few ordinances creating vicarages which do not provide for the vicar's bearing some of the burdens that fell upon the church.[1]

We cannot, however, go far wrong if we consider the stipendiary chaplains and assistant priests as forming the lowest-paid grade of the body of priests and beneficed clergy. Below them come the unbeneficed minor clergy, a little above them the perpetual vicars and poorest rectors, and on an altogether different economic and social plane the rectors of the really valuable churches. If, further, we suppose the average chaplain to have had from all sources before the Black Death an income of six or seven marks, and accept forty-eight shillings as a moderate estimate of the income of a first-class agricultural labourer,[2] such as a ploughman or carter, at the same period, we have some indication of whereabouts in the social scale to place the great mass of poorly paid parish clergy.[3]

After the Black Death there was a general tendency for wages to rise, from which the clergy benefited as well as laymen. Those with fixed incomes of course fell into a relatively, if not absolutely, worse position, and it is to be remarked, too, that at about the same time the activities of the friars were probably having an injurious effect upon the financial resources of the secular clergy.[4] It is possible

[1] E.g. *Rot. H. de Welles*, I. 47, 'Adjecit autem dominus Episcopus huic provisioni ut persona illius ecclesie hospitium Archidiacono faciat et vicarius sinodalia solvat.' *Reg. Th. de Cantilupo*, 45, 'Item ordinamus quod dictus vicarius et successores sui subeant et agnoscant omnia onera ordinaria et extraordinaria dicte ecclesie incumbencia, excepta reparacione et reformacione cancelli dicte ecclesie . . . et invencione librorum in eadem.'

[2] *Cf.* Thorold Rogers, *op. cit.* I. 289.

[3] *Cf. Rot. H. de Welles*, II. 300, 'Vicarius . . . habebit etiam victum suum de abbatia in omnibus sicut canonicus, et diaconus suus ut major serviens de abbatia. . . .' This possibly indicates the relative social position of an unbeneficed deacon.

[4] *Cf.* Fitz Ralph's *Defensorium Curatorum*, 468, 469, 472 (1357). The matter is a subject of frequent reference in contemporary literature: e.g. *Piers Plowman*, A. Prol. ll. 55 ff., B. V. 136 ff., C. VII. 118 ff.; *Romaunt of the Rose* (English translation), ll. 6377 ff.; *Canterbury Tales*, 'Prologue,' ll. 208 ff., 701 ff., D. 1715 ff.; *English Works of Wyclif*, 154, 445; *Pierce*

therefore that the poorer vicars and rectors tended to fall in the social scale after about 1350.[1] The chaplains, however, maintained their position, although, for the most part, the point of view of the ecclesiastical authorities had altered and they sought to restrain the demands of the stipendiary clergy,[2] whose economic position was apparently now so strong that they could enforce the old minimum wage without help from above and could exact also a considerable addition thereto.[3] It then became the fashion to limit the wages of chaplains to six marks,[4] but in 1378 Archbishop

the Ploughmans Crede, ll. 460 ff. Records of the settlement of disputes between incumbents and friars will be found in episcopal registers: e.g. *Reg. Stephani Gravesend*, 217 (Rector of St. Olave and Crossed Friars—1319), *Reg. J. de Trillek*, 195 (Rector of Ludlow and Carmelites—1353). The University of Oxford still refer to the question in 1414: Wilkins, *Concilia*, III. 364.

[1] Cf. *Piers Plowman*, A. Prol., ll. 80 ff.

'Persones and parisch prestes · playneth to heore bisschops,
That heore parisch hath ben pore · seththe the pestilence tyme' . . .

This passage is repeated in the B. and C. texts, which points to the evil continuing. The reference, it is true, may be satirical, but not necessarily ironical.

[2] Wilkins, *Concilia*, III. 1, 69, 135: *Reg. J. de Trillek*, 159, 'ordinavimus quod singuli sacerdotes tam parochiani quam alii moderatis stipendiis de cetero erunt contenti. . . .' *Cf.* St. 36 Edw. III, c. 8, 'Chapelleins sont devenuz trop chiers puis la pestilence, a grande grevance et oppression du poeple.' *Rot. Parl.* II. 368, 'Item supplionts les dites Communes a Roy lour Seigneur, qe les Prestres qi preignent trop outrageouse lower, et ceux qi leur doignent trop outrageouse lower, qe l'un et l'autre soient chastiez par vos Justices . . .' In the *Acta Synodi Eliensis* (1364), however, a different tone is adopted: 'Ipsis autem sacerdotibus sufficiens et honesta tribuatur sustentatio ab ecclesiarum rectoribus, ne propter diminutam sustentationem oporteat ecclesias divinis obsequiis carere, aut ipsos sacerdotes lucris turpibus vacare, seu victum mendicare': *Concilia*, III. 60.

[3] *Cf.* previous note and Thorold Rogers, *op. cit.* II. 615, where is mentioned the case of a chaplain who threatened that he would not stay unless he received 16*s.* 8*d.* a term.

[4] This was first done by Archbishop Simon Islip in 1350: Wilkins, *Concilia*, III. 1. This ecclesiastical enactment was enforced by civil legislation in 1362, which prohibited the payment by a layman of more than the amount fixed by the ecclesiastical authorities: St. 36 Edw. III, c. 8. Archbishop Thoresby of York in 1367 also fixed the maximum for stipendiary chaplains at six marks: *Concilia*, III. 69.

Sudbury, after deploring the cupidity of priests who were not content with reasonable stipends, raised the maximum wage of priests with cure of souls to eight marks and that of 'annuelers' to seven marks.[1] But wages continued to rise despite both civil and ecclesiastical ordinance, and a statute of Henry V concedes a maximum of nine marks if the ordinary should license that amount.[2]

It is well to remark, lest it should be supposed that the parish clergy suffered from a wellnigh universal depression of income, that the conception of a wealthy parson was not entirely foreign to contemporary popular literature. Robert of Brunne, for example, has a moral story of a Cambridgeshire parson, who had a coffer full

> 'Of florens and of goldrynges
> And of many ouþer þynges
> Þat were of syluer, vesseles,
> And gold and ouþer Iuweles.'[3]

In the 'Ayenbite of Inwyt,' too, there is a story of a rich priest who had a hundred kine, which he lost through his cupidity.[4] Moreover the parson who was also lord of a manor is not unknown,[5] and evidence of wealth possessed by parsons and chaplains will be found sufficiently abundant in the Close Rolls.[6] But, for all that, the evidence which

[1] Wilkins, *Concilia*, III. 135.

[2] 2 Hen. V, St. 2, c. 2 (1414). Lyndwood's point of view is instructive: he frankly regards the old rates in force before Sudbury's enactment as inadequate: *Provinciale*, 64, 65.

[3] *Handlyng Synne*, ll. 6173 ff.

[4] *Ayenbite*, 191. Cf. Richard Rolle, *Fire of Love*, 24; *Piers Plowman*, A. I. ll. 164 ff.; *Political Songs*, 327.

[5] *Suffolk Hundred*, xvi. *seq.*: 'Nicholas the son of Reyner, who was lord of the manor of Witnesham as well as parson of the church there.' Cf. *Cal. Close Rolls, Edw. III*, Vol. IX. 2, where it is stated that Humphrey de Bassyngburn held a castle, messuage, land and manor for life of the grant of Master William de Bray, parson of Abynton church, and of John Walgor of Bitham, chaplain.

[6] E.g. *ibid.* 54 (parson of Wygan owes £200 to parson of Preston), 55, 75 (John Baudechoun owes £400 to parson of Southwokyndon), 86, 147, 148.

has been already adduced appears to point to the conclusion that the typical parish priest of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries was essentially a peasant priest, taking his place among the more prosperous freemen and copyholders of the village community. One of the manorial aristocracy, as Maitland termed them,[1] perhaps the chief of that aristocracy, but still essentially of it and not above it. The minor clergy of the parish must have come a little lower in the scale: like Absolon, perhaps, a friend of the smith,[2] but consorting easily with any member of a community in which social distinctions were not greatly insisted upon.

Many of the parish clergy must, like Chaucer's poor parson, have had a ploughman for a brother: many indeed began life as serfs.[3] Receiving but a small income, taking part with everyone else in the tillage of the common fields, often mated to a woman of the countryside, the only way in which it was reasonably possible for them to rise above the peasant class was by means of education. But although schools were frequent at least in towns and, by means of the office of holy-water-bearer, it was sought to provide for poor scholars, yet the ignorance of the clergy is a subject for constant comment and apparently ineffective legislation.[4] And not only were they ignorant, but priests seem to have been found to indulge in the grossest of superstitious practices, to

> take away the clothes of the aulter, and clothe the aultre with dolefulle clothynge, or besette the aulter or the crosse about with thornes, and withdraw lighte out of the churche, or synge . . .

[1] *Court Baron*, 113.

[2] 'The Milleres Tale,' ll. 3760 ff.

[3] Manumissions for purpose of entering orders: *Reg. J. de Drokensford*, 33, 40, 92, 96; *Reg. R. Shrewsbury*, 158, 551, 618, *et passim*. Licences to send sons to school and take orders: Thorold Rogers, *op. cit.* II. 613, 615, 616. Cf. *Testament of Love*, II. cap. 2, 'therfore he shulde ete benebreed (and so did his syre) his estate ther-with to strengthen': Skeat's *Chaucer*, VII. 51.

[4] See Appendix II.; *Concilia*, II. 54, 143–4, 300.

masse of Requiem for them that bene alyue, in hope that they shulde fare the worse and the sooner deye.[1]

Since the average parish priest was hardly to be expected to rise to any considerable intellectual level above his flock, it is only natural to find him indulging in the sports and convivialities of the countryside. The author of the B text of 'Piers Plowman' introduced a character Sloth who in his more amiable characteristics must typify with fair exactness the more ignorant of the country clergy. He says:

> 'I haue be prest and parsoun · passynge thretti wynter,
> ȝete can I neither solfe ne synge · ne seyntes lyues rede,
> But I can fynde in a felde · or in a fourlonge an hare,
> Better than in *beatus vir* · or in *beati omnes*
> Construe oon clause wel · and kenne it to my parochienes.
> I can holde louedayes · and here a reues rekenynge,
> Ac in canoun ne in the decretales · I can nouȝte rede a lyne.'[2]

The hunting to which Sloth refers was a weakness with the parish clergy, and when they could not have it by lawful means they went poaching just as their parishioners did.[3] And since, too, tavern-going and games of chance were dear to the peasant's heart, we find the parish clergy drinking and playing with their flock. Chaucer could view such conduct with a smile—

> 'In al the toun nas brewhous ne taverne
> That he ne visited with his solas,
> Ther any gaylard tappestere was.'[4]

[1] *Dives and Pauper*, 51 recto. A parallel statement will be found among the documents printed in the *Proceedings against Dame Alice Kyteler*, xxxii.

[2] B. V. ll. 422 ff.

[3] *English Works of Wyclif*, 151, 'þey taken here worldly myrþe, haukynge & huntynge & oþere vanytes doynge.' Cf. Richard Rolle, '*Epistola ad simplices sacerdotes*'; *Yorkshire Writers*, II. 62: *Piers Plowman*, B. III. ll. 309 ff.: Gower, *Mirour de l'Omme*, ll. 20314 ff.; *Vox Clamantis*, III. ll. 1493 ff.: *Dives and Pauper*, 68 *recto*: Wilkins, *Concilia*, II. 152. Actual cases of poaching by parish clergy: *Forest Pleas*, 19, 31, 33, 37, 38, 58, 71, 73, 88; *Court Baron*, 131; *Cal. Pat. Rolls, Edw. III*, VIII. 176, 318; *Halmota Prioratus Dunelm.* 122, 125, 147; *History of Castle Combe*, 155 n., 164, 165; *Reg. J. de Drokensford*, 4.

[4] This is Absolon in the 'Milleres Tale,' ll. 3334 ff.

But to the reforming spirits no exaggeration nor condemnation was too great.

Þei haunten tauernes out of all mesure & stiren lewid men to dronkenesse, ydelnesse & cursed swerynge & chydynge & fi;ttynge . . . Þei fallen to nyse pleies, at tables, chees & hasard, & beten þe stretis, & sitten at þe tauerne til þei han lost here witt, & þan chiden & stryuen & fi;ten sumtyme, & sumtyme neiþer han ei;e ne tonge ne hond ne foot to helpe hem self for dronkenesse.[1]

Yet drunken as they may at times have been, poor, frequently ignorant and sometimes neglectful of their vows, the parish clergy were still for the most part faithful to their flock. At the worst their influence is seen as popular leaders in that not altogether ignoble economic revolt after the Black Death, 'not ashamed that their insatiable avarice is taken as an example': [2] and if rebellion is not where we might wish to find them, yet is it testimony to their devotion that they did not refuse to embrace death in the cause of the poor: [3] and there were those from whose unselfish and radiant lives, unsoiled by violence or arms, Chaucer could draw for all time the portrait of the perfect parish priest.

APPENDIX I

The Parish Clergy and Marriage

Wilkins' 'Concilia' contains repeated injunctions by Synods, Legates and Bishops of the thirteenth century requiring the removal of 'focariae' and 'concubinae' from the homes of the clergy and, further, that they should not be kept elsewhere.[4]

[1] *English Works of Wyclif*, 152. [2] Wilkins, *Concilia*, III. 1.

[3] As to rising before 1381, *cf.* Trenholme, *Risings in the English Monastic Towns in* 1327, 661: Powell, *East Anglia Rising*, 16. As to rising of 1381, *cf.* Oman, *Great Revolt*, 45, 47, 48, 96, 101. John Ball, of course, was a parish priest: cf. *ibid.* 41 *seq.*, 87.

[4] Wilkins, *Concilia*, I. 573–4 (Concilium Dunelmense—about 1220: Statutes, 'De focariis amovendis'; 'De punienda incontinentia clericorum'; 'De poena et satisfactione focariarum sacerdotum'; 'De poena ipsius,

Repeated reference is also made to the negligence and venality of bishops, archdeacons and other ecclesiastical officials, and they too are threatened with penalties.[1] The written law was explicit, the legal penalties were very severe, and the plain prohibition of concubinage must have been known to every priest and beneficed clerk in the country; yet in the 'Vision of Piers Plowman,'[2] in Chaucer[3] and in Gower,[4] as well as in less-known fourteenth-century authors[5] the strictures upon unlawful unions

qui polluit filiam spiritualem'); 590 (Concilium Oxoniense, 1222); 653 (Constitutiones Othonis cardinalis, cap. XVI.—1237); 672–3 (Constitutiones W. de Cantilupo, Wigorn. Episc.—1240); 692 (Statuta R. de la Wich, Cicestren. Episcopi—1246); 705 (Constitutiones W. de Kirkham, Episc. Dunelm.—1255); 716–7 (Constitutiones Ae. de Bridport, Sarum Episc.—1256); II. 5 (Constitutiones Dom. Othoboni, cap. VIII.—1268); 36 (Archbishop Peckham—1279); 142 (Exeter Synod—1287); 169 (Bp. of Chichester—1289).

[1] *Ibid.* I. 573, 'Praelati, quoque, qui tales in suis iniquitatibus praesumant sustinere, maxime obtentu pecuniae, vel alterius commodi temporalis, pari subjaceant ultioni.' Cf. *ibid.* II. 5 (Cardinal Ottobon's Constitutions), 36, 'statutum domini Ottoboni contra concubinarios editum praecipimus in suo rigore inviolabiliter observari.' Gower, *Mirour de l'Omme*, ll. 20089 *seq.*

[2] A. III. ll. 145 ff.:

> 'Prouendreres, persuns · preostes heo [Meede] meynteneth,
> To holde lemmons and lotebyes · al heor lyf-dayes,
> And bringeth forth barnes · aȝeyn forbodene lawes.'

[3] The 'Parsons Tale,' ll. 897–9, 'Swiche preestes been the sones of Helie, as sheweth in the book of Kinges, that they weren the sones of Belial, that is, the devel. Belial is to seyn "with-outen Iuge"; and so faren they; hem thinketh they been free, and han no Iuge, na-more than hath a free bole that taketh which cow that him lyketh in the toun. So faren they by wommen. For right as a free bole is y-nough for al a toun, right so is a wikked preest corrupcion y-nough for al a parisshe, or for al a contree.'

[4] *Vox Clamantis*, III. ll. 1549 *seq.*:

> 'O si curatis nati succedere possent
> Ecclesie titulo ferreque iura patrum,
> Tunc sibi Romipetas, mortis quibus est aliene
> Spes, nihil aut modicum posse valere puto.'

[5] Robert of Brunne, *Handlyng Synne*, ll. 7935 *seq.*; Richard de Bury, *Philobiblon*, 31–2, 176–7. These passages are cited in the text. *Political Songs*, 326, 'Poem on the evil times of Edward II,' ll. 49 *seq.*

> 'And thise ersedeknes that ben set to visite holi churche,
> Everich fondeth hu he may shrewedlichest worche;
> He wole take mede of that on and that other,
> And late the parsoun have a wyf, and the prest another, at wille;
> Coveytise shall stoppen here mouth, and maken hem al stille.'

and incontinence are as severe as any that may be found in the ecclesiastical enactments of that and the preceding century. The lay criticism of the fourteenth century was not confined to satirists. The municipal authorities of London, for example, seem to have attempted to suppress more open vice by clapping into gaol all offending chaplains upon whom hands could be laid.[1] The Commons in 1372 protested against the ecclesiastical dignitaries who accepted bribes from concubinary clergy and asked that beneficed clerks and curates who were not proceeded against by their ordinaries should be deprived after an interval of six months.[2] At the beginning of the fifteenth century the University of Oxford was still formulating representations against the vicious lives of the clergy and the light penalties with which they escaped,[3] so little alteration had there been in their condition.

Records of the action of the bishops in specific cases may be found in episcopal registers, and these afford adequate illustration of the lightness with which offences were in general visited.[4] Threats of deprivation may be found,[5] but more frequently the penalty, when more than a threat should the offence occur, is a fine.[6] In some cases the offence may not be simply the consummation of an irregular union, and there are recorded cases of amazing licentiousness that impress the truth of the remarks in the 'Parson's Tale': *e.g.* 'rector capelle de Tedesterne . . . diffamatus super adulterio cum quadam A., uxore cujusdam parochiani sui, commisso, ac super incontinencia cum aliis mulieribus multociens, ut dicebatur, commissa'; the offender

[1] *Reg. R. Baldock*, 154 *seq.*

[2] *Rot. Parl.* II. 313–4.

[3] Wilkins, *Concilia*, III. 364 (1414).

[4] E.g. *Rot. H. de Welles*, I. 79, 87, 96, 97, 148; *Reg. J. de Halton*, 178, 190; *Reg. J. de Drokensford*, 17, 66, 166, 206; *Reg. R. Shrewsbury*, 242, 260, 261; *Reg. J. de Trillek*, 142. See also *Bodleian Norfolk Rolls*, No. 18 (containing a visitation of Norwich parishes in 1333), to which my attention has been called by Mr. G. G. Coulton, to whom I am indebted for a number of other references.

[5] E.g. *Rot. H. de Welles*, I. 87, 97. Cf. *Rot. R. Grosseteste*, 28, 'Gerardus de Housthorp, capellanus, presentatus . . . ad ecclesiam de Wisputon, vacantem per confessionem Ricardi de Land, clerici, se esse uxoratum.'

[6] *E.g.* Richard de Newenham, rector of Sandy, 'promisit se quindecim marcas soluturum nomine pene, si cum muliere, cum qua dicebatur matrimonium contraxisse, decetero cohabitasse convincatur aut in loco privato et suspecto ad eam accessum habuisse . . .': *Rot. H. de Welles*, I. 96. Cf. *ibid.* 79; *Reg. J. de Halton*, 178, 190.

is threatened with deprivation if he is again convicted ;[1] the vicar of Ardleigh is actually deprived 'super incestus et adulterii vicio cum Matilda ancilla sive domicella Alicie Martel de Ardleye ac cum eadem Alicia et Alicia filia Thome le Honte, parrochianis suis, necnon Isabella uxore Willelmi de Sarteria de Colecestre commisso.'[2] However, where the evidence is not conclusively to the contrary it is perhaps fair to assume that the woman was wife in all but name—although the pressure which ecclesiastical authorities at times exerted might bring the unsanctioned union to an untimely termination. This last point is illustrated by the record of a curious arbitration undertaken by Bishop John de Drokensford. Geoffrey, Vicar of Westbury, had had two children by Juliana, daughter of Richard Parker ; he had acknowledged his offence and had been corrected by the Dean's Official. Richard Parker stated that the vicar had also promised to provide suitable marriage for Juliana, but this Geoffrey denied. Finally the parties agreed to abide by the award of the Bishop, who determined that the vicar should pay six marks to the parents to find suitable marriage for Juliana and a further six marks, at other dates, for her benefit ; the parties were then to swear friendship and stop the scandal.[3]

The numerous passing references to sons and daughters of priests and other clergy which are found scattered throughout secular and ecclesiastical records,[4] and the frequent episcopal and papal dispensations to sons of the clergy,[5] do but confirm the only conclusion to be drawn from all other evidence—that irregular unions were at least very frequent, if not general—and refute any idea that ecclesiastical enactment and secular protest were directed against rare occurrences which shocked the conscience of churchmen and laity.

[1] *Reg. R. de Swinfield*, 282.

[2] *Reg. R. Baldock*, 160.

[3] *Reg. J. de Drokensford*, 166.

[4] E.g. *Select Pleas in Manorial Courts*, 12, 17 ; *Select Pleas of Forest*, lxxxix. 19, 39, 113, 116 ; *Suffolk Hundred*, 15, 18, Appendix (Stanton) ; *Leet Jurisdiction in Norwich*, 16, 18, 31, 44; *Reg. S. Osmundi*, I. 289, 359. The preceding references are all of the 13th century. *Halmota Prioratus Dunelm.* 13, 129 ; *Reg. R. Shrewsbury*, 361.

[5] E.g. *Reg. W. Bronescombe*, 62, 259 ; *Reg. R. de Shrewsbury*, 247, 481 ; *Reg. J. de Grandisson*, 147 ; *Papal Petitions*, 52, 92, 108, 139 (all between 1344–8) ; *Papal Letters*, III. 332 (1349).

APPENDIX II

The Education of the Parish Clergy

That schools of a sort were frequent, at least in towns, in the thirteenth and fourteenth century admits of no doubt,[1] and it is also possible that desultory attempts at imparting instruction were made in other parts of the country.[2] Adulterine schools were, however, rigorously put down in the interests of the regular and recognised schoolmasters.[3] Poor scholars were provided for by the appropriation to them of the office of holy-water bearer; this practice, however, appears to have been confined to churches not distant more than ten miles from the schools of cities and walled towns, and the corrupt administration of the office appears still further to have limited its benefits.[4] The product of the system appears, too, to have been inefficient. Robert of Brunne complains that everywhere can be seen a 'holy-water clerk' ordained priest, although he has learned little in his life.[5] However, whatever may have been the quality of the schools they appear to have been sufficiently cheap and numerous for poor people to put their children to school in such numbers as to bring forth a protest from the Commons.[6] Even if they went to a school of a fairly efficient character, few of the poorer parish clergy could have been to a University, and fewer still could have graduated.[7] Those clergy who did attend a University seem to have been largely absentee rectors in minor

[1] Leach, *Early Yorkshire Schools*, I. xix. *seq.*, II. v. *seq.*; *English Schools at Reformation*, 7, *seq.*

[2] *Early Yorkshire Schools*, II. vi. *Ancren Riwle*, 422, 'Ancre ne schal nout forwurðen scholmeistre, ne turnen hire ancre hus to childrene scole. Hire meiden mei, þauh, techen sum lutel meiden, þet were dute of forto leornen among gromes.'

[3] *Early Yorkshire Schools*, I. xxiii., xxvii. *seq.*, xlii. *seq.*

[4] Wilkins, *Concilia*, I. 641, II. 147; *Early Yorkshire Schools*, I. xxiii. *seq.*; Leach, *Educational Charters*, 232.

[5] *Handlyng Synne*, ll. 11589 ff.

[6] *Rot. Parl.* III. 294; cf. *ibid.* 602 and St. 7 Hen. IV. c. 17; *Pierce the Ploughmans Crede*, ll. 744–5:

> 'Now mot ich soutere his sone · setten to schole,
> And ich a beggers brol · on þe booke lerne.'

[7] Rashdall, *Universities*, II. 698 *seq.*

orders,[1] and when at the University it was alleged that they did little good.[2] The study of theology lay beyond the University course in Arts, and few indulged in such unprofitable learning.[3] Some provision for instruction in theology was, however, made at the cathedrals [4] and facilities appear to have been given to enable rectors to attend.[5] The results of the educational system, if it deserves that name, were acutely disappointing, to speak mildly. Apart from such ecclesiastical authorities as Archbishop Peckham, who says roundly that the ignorance of priests is hurling the people into the pit of error [6] and tells the London clergy that their 'simplicitas non sufficit aliis dirigendis,' [7] almost every contemporary author who refers to the parish clergy speaks ill of their learning. Roger Bacon in the 'Compendium Studii Philosophiae' quite casually refers to them as reciting 'officium divinum de quo parum aut nihil intelligunt sicut bruta.' [8] Robert of Brunne too has hard things to say: 'little knows the layman less than some of these priests.' [9] And these censures are repeated and affirmed in 'Piers Plowman,' [10] the 'Testament of Love,' [11] 'Dives and Pauper,' [12] by Wyclif and his followers [13] and by John Myrc.[14]

[1] This is evident from any episcopal register: e.g. *Reg. J. Pecham*, 22; *Reg. R. Shrewsbury*, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15; *Reg. J. de Drokensford*, 10, 12, 16, 17, 18, 20 *et passim*. Cf. *Defensorium Curatorum*, 474, 'de meis subjectis rectoribus tres aut quatuor misi ad studium.'

[2] *English Works of Wyclif*, 156.

[3] Rashdall, II. 700 *seq.*; *English Works of Wyclif*, 156–7; cf. *Rot. Parl.* II. 337–8.

[4] *Early Yorkshire Schools*, I. xxii. 17; *Papal Letters*, III. 596; licence of non-residence to Vicar of Mildenhall while lecturing in theology at Salisbury.

[5] *Early Yorkshire Schools*, I. 17.

[6] *Concilia*, II. 54.

[7] *Ibid.* 169. Cf. *Reg. S. Osmundi*, I. 304 *seq.*; visitation by Dean of Sarum in 1222 of clergy officiating at Sunning and dependent churches, which discloses amazing ignorance on the part of priests serving as chaplains.

[8] *Opera*, 413.

[9] *Handlyng Synne*, ll. 10965–6.

[10] B. V. ll. 422 ff., XI. ll. 289 ff., XII. ll. 184 ff.

[11] Skeat's *Chaucer*, VII. 51.

[12] *D. and P.* 151 verso, 176 recto.

[13] *English Works*, 153, 167 *et passim*.

[14] *Instructions*, ll. 5 ff.

APPENDIX III

List of Authorities Quoted

Abram, A. 'Social England in the Fifteenth Century' (1909).
'Ancren Riwle': ed. Morton, James (Camden Society, 1853).
Ashley, W. J. 'An Introduction to English Economic History and Theory' (1906).
Bacon, Roger. 'Opera quaedam hactenus inedita': ed. Brewer, J. S. (Rolls Series, 1859).
Bateson, Mary. 'Borough Customs,' Vol. II. (Selden Society, 1906).
Calendars :—
'Close Rolls, Edward III.,' Vol. IX., 1349–54 (R.S., 1906).
Papal Registers :—
'Petitions to the Pope,' Vol. I., 1342–1419 (R.S., 1896).
'Papal Letters,' Vol. III., 1342–62 (R.S., 1897).
'Patent Rolls, Edward III.,' Vol. VIII., 1348–50 (R.S., 1905).
Chaucer, Geoffrey. 'Works': ed. Skeat, W. W. (1894–1900).
Episcopal Registers, &c. :—
Bath and Wells: 'Registers of Walter Giffard, 1265–6, and of Henry Bowett, 1401–7': ed. Holmes, T. S. (Somerset Record Society, 1899).
'Calendar of the Register of John de Drokensford, 1309–29': ed. Bishop Hobhouse (Somerset Rec. Soc., 1887).
'Register of Ralph of Shrewsbury, 1329–63': ed. Holmes, T. S. (Somerset Rec. Soc., 1896).
Canterbury: 'Registrum Johannis Pecham, 1279–92' (Canterbury and York Soc., 1908–).
Carlisle: 'Registrum Johannis de Halton, 1292–1325' (Can. and York Soc., 1906–).
Coventry and Lichfield: 'Register of Roger de Norbury, 1322–58': ed. Bishop Hobhouse (Wm. Salt Archaeological Soc., Vol. I., 1880).
Exeter: 'Registers of Walter Bronescombe, 1257–80, and Peter Quivil, 1280–91, with some records of the episcopate of Thomas de Bytton, 1292–1307'; 'Register of John de Grandisson, 1327–69': ed. Hingeston-Randolph, F. C. (1889–99).

Hereford: 'Registrum Thome de Cantilupo, 1275–82': transcribed Griffiths, R. G.: introduction Capes, W. W. (Cant. and York Soc., 1907).
'Registrum Ricardi de Swinfield, 1283–1317': ed. Capes, W. W. (Cant. and York Soc., 1909).
'Registrum Ade de Orleton, 1317–27': ed. Bannister, A. T. (Cant. and York Soc., 1908).
'Registrum Johannis de Trillek, 1344–60' (Cant. and York Soc., 1911–).
Lincoln: 'Liber Antiquus de Ordinationibus Vicariarum tempore Hugonis Wells, 1209–35': ed. Gibbons, A. (1888).
'Rotuli Hugonis de Welles, 1209–35': ed. Phillimore, W. P. W. (Cant. and York Soc., 1907–9).
'Rotuli Roberti Grosseteste, 1235–53' (Cant. and York Soc., 1910–).
London: 'Registrum Radulphi Baldock, 1306–13, Gilberti Segrave, 1313–16, Ricardi Newport, 1317–18, et Stephani Gravesend, 1319–38' (Cant. and York Soc., 1910–).
Norwich: Bodleian Norfolk Rolls, No. 18 (Visitation of 1333).
Salisbury: 'Register of S. Osmund' (R.S. 1883–4).
FitzRalph, Richard. 'Defensorium Curatorum contra eos qui privilegiatos se dicunt (1357)'—in Edward Brown's 'Fasciculus,' Vol. II. (1690).
Gower, John. 'Works': ed. Macaulay, G. C. (1899–1902).
'Halmota Prioratus Dunelmensis': ed. Longstaffe, W. H., and Booth, J. (Surtees Soc., 1889).
Hudson, W. 'Leet Jurisdiction in the City of Norwich during the XIIIth and XIVth Centuries' (Selden Soc., 1892).
'The Three Earliest Subsidies for the County of Sussex in the Years 1296, 1327, 1332' (Sussex Record Soc., 1909).
Leach, A. F. 'English Schools at the Reformation' (1896).
'Early Yorkshire Schools' (Yorkshire Arch. Assen., 1899, 1903).
'Educational Charters and Documents, 598 to 1909' (1911).
Lyndwood, W. 'Provinciale' (1679).
Maitland, F. W. 'Select Pleas in Manorial and other Seignorial Courts' (Selden Soc., 1889).
Maitland, F. W., and Baildon, W. P. 'The Court Baron' (Selden Soc., 1891).

Michel, Dan. 'Ayenbite of Inwyt': ed. Morris, R. (E.E.T.S., 1866).
Myrc, John. 'Instructions for Parish Priests': ed. Peacock, E. (E.E.T.S., 1902).
Oman, C. 'The Great Revolt' (1906).
'Pierce the Ploughmans Crede': ed. Skeat, W. W. (1906).
'Piers the Plowman': ed. Skeat, W. W. (1886).
Powell, E. 'The East Anglia Rising in 1381' (1896).
'A Suffolk Hundred in the Year 1283' (1910).
Rashdall, H. 'The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages' (1895).
Richard de Bury. 'Philobiblon,' ed. Thomas, E. C. (1888).
Riley, H. T. 'Memorials of London and London Life' (1868).
Robert of Brunne. 'Handlyng Synne,' ed. Furnivall, F. J. (E.E.T.S., 1901–3).
Rolle, Richard. 'The Fire of Love,' ed. Harvey, R. (E.E.T.S., 1896).
'Yorkshire Writers. Richard Rolle of Hampole . . . and his followers': ed. Horstman, C. (1895–6).
'Rotuli Parliamentorum.'
Scrope, G. P. 'History of Castle Combe' (1852).
'Statutes of the Realm.' (Record Com., 1810–28).
'Taxatio Ecclesiastica.' (Record Com., 1802).
Thorold Rogers, J. E. 'The History of Agriculture and Prices in England' (1866–1902).
Tithe Apportionments for Hildersham, Runton, Shinfield, Portland, Upton St. Leonard's, Steventon, Castor and Ailsworth, Sutton.
Trenholme, N. M. 'The Risings in the English Monastic Towns in 1327.' (*American Historical Review*, Vol. VI., 1901.)
Turner, G. J. 'Select Pleas of the Forest' (Selden Soc., 1901)
'Victoria County Histories—Essex,' Vol. II. (1907).
'London,' Vol. I. (1909).
Wilkins, D. 'Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae' (1737).
Willard, J. F. 'The English Church and the Lay Taxes of the XIVth Century.' (*Univ. of Colorado Studies*, IV., 1907.)
Wright, T. 'Proceedings against Dame Alice Kyteler' (Camden Soc., 1843).
'Political Songs of England. From the reign of John to that of Edward II.' (Camden Soc., 1839).
Wyclif, John. 'The English Works of—hitherto unprinted': ed. Matthew, F. D. (E.E.T.S., 1880).

THE COMMONWEALTH CHARTERS

By B. L. K. HENDERSON, M.A., F.R.Hist.S.

Read March 21, 1912

In Vol. XI. of the 'Camden Miscellany,' published by this Society, there appears the text of the charter granted to the city of Salisbury in the year 1656, under circumstances which are described by the late Dr. S. R. Gardiner in his 'History of the Protectorate,'[1] as well as by the Director of the Society, on whom devolved the task of editing the transcript which had been made for Dr. Gardiner from the city muniments.

In view of the interest attaching to the history of these civic charters, and the obscurity of the subject, I have had the honour of being invited to communicate to the Society a portion of the studies on which I have been for some time past engaged.

Throughout the Interregnum there was, apparently, a sustained effort to influence the towns through their charters. We can trace this process in some measure through the years ensuing upon the death of the king; but our information is much more complete in the years of the Protectorate, and this is doubtless due to the fact that the movement assumed an augmented significance in this later period. The operations of a Committee for Corporations are traceable in sundry references amongst the sources of this troublous time. In January 1649 a petition of the Lord Mayor and Common Council of London was referred to the Committee for Corporations,[2] and the Committee seemed to assume added

[1] Vol. iii. chapter x. and supplementary chapter xlix.

[2] *Journal of House of Commons*, vol. vi. 351.

importance as time went on. The act of July 1649 was referred to the same committee, and it was after that body had deliberated that the act was debated upon in the House and finally printed and published.[1] A further act followed in October of that year. In December 1650 we find the committee for the advance of money handing over some of its petitions to the Committee for Corporations. In 1651 the recorder of the city of Chester was discharged from his office, and later on other changes were effected in the composition of the same municipal body.[2] A further step in the work of the Committee was taken in September 1652, when the question arose 'how Corporations may be settled conformably with the government of a Commonwealth, and how their respective charters may be altered and renewed to be held from and under the authority of a Commonwealth.'[3] In this same year it was enacted that 'all who come to the Committee for Corporations shall have voices,' and that 'if anything concerns the charter of any Corporation for which any member serves in Parliament notice shall be given to such member before the Committee sends for the charter.'[4]

Evidence as to the grant of charters at this time is very meagre, although there is a statement that York and Exeter received charters in 1653.[5] It is, however, clear that the Government reviewed closely the question of the town charters and saw possibilities in this direction. In the case of Beccles, in 1652, we know that the charter was called for and that the Portreeve was enabled to evade the summons; from which we may possibly surmise that either the relations of the towns to the Government were felt to be ill-defined or else that the Government did not wish to enforce its authority.[6]

[1] In 1649 Parliament granted an exemplification of Charles I's Charter to Reading.

[2] *Journal of House of Commons*, vol. vii. 1651. Humble petition of the well-affected inhabitants in the city of Chester, vol. vii. 1653.

[3] *Ibid.* [4] *Ibid.* [5] Wyon's *Great Seals of England*, pp. 90–98.

[6] Report of Commissioners on Municipal Corporations, 1835.

The Instrument of Government came into force the next year, and the system of government was thereby revolutionised. On the 21st September 1655 Cromwell appointed his Major-Generals, and, in response to their appeals, he evidently began to consider seriously the question of the Municipal Charters. Dr. Gardiner has said that the operations of the Committee for Municipal Charters have not been traced to an earlier date than the 4th April 1656, 'although it must have been working before then.' The full activity of the Committee is seen in the years 1656 and 1657, but that charters were granted earlier is shown by the fact that the first Swansea Charter bears date 26 February 1655–6. Chester received an exemplification in March 1654–5.[1] In September 1655 Lyme Regis, in Dorset, obtained a special grant.[2] Ipswich also received an exemplification between September 1653 and September 1654.[3] Salisbury was busily agitating for its new charter in December, January and February 1655–6. It therefore seems uncertain when Cromwell definitely appointed a fresh Committee; but it is beyond dispute that he employed well-known and perfectly understood machinery for his scheme. It is also obvious that he employed men who were carefully chosen to give full consideration to the local circumstances which might arise.[4] The names of Desborough, Sydenham, Jones, Lambert, Wolsley and Lisle appear in connexion with the Committee; and we find that Peter Brereton, William Sheppard, Thomas Manby and Gabriel Beck were to consider 'all the charters the renewing of which is prayed and draw up all alterations proposed to be made with such variations as they think best for religion and good government, and the discouraging of vice; also make a statement of the usual charge of passing charters that it may be

[1] Audit Office, Accounts Various, 663–5. [2] *Ibid.*

[3] Declared Accounts, Audit Office, Bdles 1377–8.

[4] 'Cromwell always advised with the greatest lawyers of the land before he put his deliberations in execution.' Somers' *Tracts, First Collection*, vol. iii. 'A modest vindication.'

reduced to a moderate proportion, and present what they prepare to the Committee for Charters.' [1] We also learn that the Committee was carefully watched so that no pecuniary motives should influence it. Certain men of importance were appointed to learn ' if the Commissioners do take fees and report.' [2]

It is interesting to observe, at this point, that we are able to trace the career of one of the Commissioners in some detail. William Sheppard was a voluminous writer at the period, and amongst other works he published in 1659 a treatise entitled 'Of Corporations,' which appears to contain to some extent reflections based upon his work as a member of this Committee. As a lawyer, however, he lost caste after the Restoration from his close association with the Protector, and must have suffered considerable poverty.[3]

In examining the machinery which produced the Commonwealth Charters, it is necessary to consider the nature of the charter in question. One can conveniently group the issues under the several headings: Charters for Municipal Incorporation, Incorporation of the members of a trade, Charters for the establishment of Colleges, or Markets, and Ecclesiastical grants. Generally it will be found that application preceded the issue of a charter. When a petition was received the Committee for Charters discussed its merits, and afterwards, if it saw fit, placed the matter in the hands of an experienced legal Sub-Committee to draft a charter. Disputed points were referred to counsel learned. The

[1] *Calendar of State Papers, Dom. Series*, 1655–6, p. 370.

[2] *Ibid.* 1656–7. January 13th. There are other references to the same effect.

[3] For further information as to this man see the following works: *Reliquiae Baxterianae; Dictionaries of Literature and Authors; Bibliotheca Legum; Clarke Papers*, ed. by C. H. Firth (vol. iii. pp. 61 and 64); *Dictionary of National Biography; Gloucestershire Notes and Queries*, ed. by B. H. Blacker (vol. ii. pp. 508 and 570, and vol. iii. p. 61); *Brief History of the Sheppard Family*, by W. A. Sheppard (Calcutta, 1891); *Cal. S. P., Dom. S.*, 24 Nov. 1657; *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum*, collected and edited by C. H. Firth and R. S. Rait, *passim*.

Attorney-General perused the heads of the amended charter, and finally an order was given to advise his Highness to approve the report and issue a warrant for preparing a charter accordingly.[1] It is to be noted that in the case of many charters which were granted, there is apparently no evidence of enrolment amongst the Chancery Patent Rolls, nor can any subsidiary instrument or draft be traced at the Record Office amongst the Chancery Records. The Records for the period are incomplete. 'The MS. Chancery Index of Patents ends in the year 1655, and there is no bundle of Privy Seals, King's Bills or warrants for the date.'[2] The 'Hanaper Controlment Books' are for the following dates: 29 September 1654 to 29 September 1655; 27 January 1656 to 29 September 1657; and for the year ending Michaelmas 1659. There is a fragment for the period 12 December 1655 to 27 January 1656, but this is almost indecipherable in places. The Declared Accounts of the Pipe Office and Audit Office are dated 1654 to 1657.

In considering the several types of Cromwell's charters we find that among the municipal charters there are six towns which present a specially interesting aspect to the historian, inasmuch as he is able in these instances to piece together, more or less satisfactorily, the local conditions which accompanied the application for and grant of the charter. These towns are Colchester, Reading, King's Lynn, Swansea, Chipping Wycombe and Salisbury. It is quite possible that, if local history in the case of other municipalities were equally illuminating, they also would supply circumstances more or less analogous to these six; but, as the matter now stands, we find it convenient to adopt these six charters as typical. It is impossible in the present limits to offer even a summary view of these municipal grants with their accompanying civic contentions. It must suffice to say

[1] See *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series*, for 1655–8 *passim*. The case of Blandford is illuminating.

[2] *Camden Miscellany, loc. cit.*

that, as one naturally would expect, there is evidence in five instances of considerable contention ; in the remaining instance, that of Swansea, it can be readily inferred. In all these instances, except at Salisbury, one of the conditions of the new charters was either an added, or an altered Parliamentary representation. In the majority of these typical instances we can trace the intervention of the local Major-General. This is also partly true in the case of some of the other municipalities which are not here accepted as typical owing to the lack of contemporary local information, for example, Woodstock and Leeds. It will be well, however, to examine somewhat closely into the local history of one of our six types in order to appreciate in some measure the reasons for Cromwell's issue of a new charter.

Before so doing one may be pardoned, perhaps, for reference to the interesting discussion which some years ago ranged itself round the question of the Colchester Charter. Dr. Gardiner, recognising that the town corporations were in the great majority of instances far from being popular bodies but were controlled by a close body independent of central government, saw in Cromwell's policy the necessity for supporting the loyal minority in certain quarters. He argued that while charters were renewed in other places besides Colchester, the only trace of a political object is to be found in Carlisle.[1] Elsewhere, he observed, local causes prompted the remodelling of Corporations. The case of Colchester was exceptional, as nowhere else were parties arrayed against one another in a struggle so decided and prolonged.[2] On the other hand Mr. Round found Colchester a valuable type. He said that Cromwell, like Charles II after him, employed the same method of altering the electorate by obtaining a voluntary surrender of borough charters, and issued new charters framing the constitution on

[1] But it does not appear that Carlisle ever received a charter from Cromwell.

[2] *History of Protectorate, op. cit.*

a more oligarchical model.[1] Both these writers were content to argue from the case of Colchester. But other towns furnish us with facts which point to an approximation of civic disturbance. We must, however, be content to examine one town as typical.

Affairs at Reading at this time furnish a somewhat tedious and perplexed narrative, but they illustrate the question before us. A pamphlet at the British Museum hints very directly at a disturbed religious life in Reading in the year 1655.[2] It is a reply to slanders and calumnies which had been rife in the Corporation, and refers incidentally to the apparently vexed question of the election of the schoolmaster.[3] Fortunately this pamphlet can be supplemented by municipal records which are published in the 'Historical Manuscripts Report.'[4] Mr. Robert Jennings, M.A., was appointed schoolmaster in July 1655, and after a very short time was displaced in favour of a new man, Mr. Gerrard. We find that in December 1655 Mr. W. Brackston was discharged from his office, as alderman and justice of the peace, in pursuance of the Lord Protector's Declaration for settling the peace of the Commonwealth. In January Mr. Christopher Fowler[5] on behalf of himself and Mr. Ford[6] asked that the scandals on them should be removed. They had been charged with having intermeddled unduly in the affairs of the town, and now desired to clear themselves. The Mayor, and aldermen present who had been Mayors, made affirmation in their support. Thus there was no sign of special contention in the municipal body on that occasion. But on this same day Mr. Gerrard, the newly appointed schoolmaster, produced his order from

[1] *Historical Review*, vol. xv.; *Nineteenth Century*, vol. xlvi.

[2] E. 868, *Reply of the Mayor of Reading*, by Christopher Fowler.

[3] This turbulence can be illustrated, of course, from many towns at this time; but Maidstone (*Calendar State Papers, Domestic Series*, August 1656) and Kingston (*ibid.* 2 May 1655) are very interesting examples.

[4] Vol. ii. app. vii. pp. 190–4.

[5] He was ejected from St. Mary's in 1662, and died 1679.

[6] The well-known puritan minister and writer. He conformed after the Restoration, and died in 1699. See *Hist. MSS. Report* 11, app. vii.

the Lord Protector appointing him schoolmaster 'during the life of Mr. Page from whom the same was sequestered.' This was effected after the new man had produced certificates from University authorities as to his godly life and conversation. If there were no other cause for wrangling, here at least was a bone of contention. In March the plot thickens. Mr. D. Blagrave, a man who in January 1648–9 had been elected as burgess for Parliament, was discharged from the office of Steward of the Borough on the charge of insufficiency and neglect. Further he lost his office as one of the assistants, and finally in August 1657 he 'was removed and discharged.'

On the 7th April 1656 an application was made to the Lord Protector for confirmation of the charter of the town. On June 7th a further request was made that there be such additional privileges as should be thought fit; and in July Lord Whitlocke advised that the charter should be renewed as speedily as possible. On the 21st July 'the company and divers other people assembled in the Town Hall to seek God for a blessing in the choice of a burgess for the borough to serve in Parliament.' Mr. Ford and Mr. Jemmatt performed the duties of exhortation and prayer for that purpose, and the conclusion of the matter was that Sir John Barkstead, Lieutenant of the Tower, was elected. The next day he was admitted as freeman of the Borough. In October of that year (1656) there was a debate concerning the additional points to be considered in the renewing of the charter: (1) whether the company, or those that pay to the poor elect the burgess for Parliament; (2) whether the assizes for the county shall be held only at Reading.

The question of the schoolmaster now recurs. Mr. Gerrard made complaint that Mr. Jemmatt (who performed the duties of exhortation previously mentioned) 'comes into the school and beats and misuses the schollers.' This was in October. By the following March Mr. Gerrard was cited by an order of the Commissioners for Ejecting

Scandalous Schoolmasters to appear at Speenham upon a reference from the Lord Protector upon the petition of Mr. Robert Jennings. In July 1657, in the open market at Reading, Cromwell was proclaimed Lord Protector, the petition of Parliament to his Highness was read and published, and in August there was a perambulation of the outbounds and limits of the borough made in accordance with the charter.

The fuller significance of this narrative of affairs is seen in the events which ensued upon Cromwell's death. It is recorded that Richard Cromwell was proclaimed Protector in September 1658–9, and the minutes contain a statement that the warrant of the sheriff, and form of proclamation, with a copy of the order of the Council 'remaine in the press cupbord in the Councell Chamber.' In December Mr. Joel Stephens was voted out of the office of Mayor for that 'he hath knowingly and willingly by forreine and private advice and practice attempted to acte and acted severall things against the judgment and consent of the major parte of the said Corporation and to the disinherison of the said Corporation of their rights and priviledges.'[1] The feelings of the town were clearly in a ferment; for there was a disturbance at the meeting owing to the dispute about 'a suit of law upon the former false returne of Sir John Barkstead as burgess in Parliament,' and the cupboard and great iron-bound chest were broken open and the books, mace and common seal removed. As a consequence all the aldermen and assistants who took part in 'these great, and insolent, and notorious misdemeanours and offences,' were removed from office. They endeavoured to take their seats later on, but upon refusal of permission

[1] It should be observed that there had been no settled rule for a considerable time with regard to elections in Reading. Dr. Gardiner draws attention to three methods adopted there in the years 1627, 1645 and 1648. In 1654 the mayor declared that Colonel Hammond was elected by the Corporation, but on a shout of protest from the crowd the townsmen were allowed to give their votes. *History of Protectorate*, vol. iii. p. 10.

the meeting was broken up. Law-suits followed and we find that in May 1660 the secluded members of the Corporation resigned. In the meantime, however, on the 30th December 1658, Daniel Blagrave (who had been turned out of office in March 1656) was unanimously elected burgess, together with Henry Nevill, by near 1000 persons. In February next Peter Burningham and William Brackston were restored as aldermen, Richard Bulstrade was removed from his position as steward and Daniel Blagrave chosen in his room. In April 1660 Thomas Richard and John Blagrave were elected burgesses by more than 1,100 persons.[1]

This detailed account serves to illustrate the fact that Reading provides us with a position similar to that at Colchester. It is clear that the town received a charter in support of the well-affected minority, and directly the Protector died the bands which held the majority in check were burst asunder. The number of persons at the two subsequent elections gives us a clue to the size of the opposition and confirms the statement that the Mayor, Stephens, had acted against the major part of the Corporation. The election of Sir John Barkstead to the Parliament of 1656 was an answer to the appeal of Major-Generals for 'the doing of something effective in the charters.' The removal of the mayor from office in December 1658, and the subsequent removal and resignation of the aldermen, together with the re-appointment of those men who were ejected from office during the Protectorate, indicate most conclusively the fact that, in Reading as at Colchester, Cromwell employed his new municipal machinery to keep his enemies at bay. With regard to the charter itself we know nothing beyond the two points previously mentioned; but we may infer from the intent of other charters, of which we know the substance, that Cromwell strove to improve the trade conditions

[1] These numbers appear very large. Dr. Gardiner has commented upon the paucity of voters in those days. In 1654 there were at Colchester only 200; at Leicester, in 1656, only 59; while at Newcastle (a very populous place) there were 600 voters. *History of Protectorate*, vol. iii. p. 7.

of the town. It would appear that he won little gratitude and that the town was ready to return to its old form of municipal government.[1]

With regard to the intervention of the Major-Generals in municipal affairs in 1656, and particularly with regard to the election of the summer of that year, Dr. Gardiner observes that from the scanty evidence which has reached us the Protector showed no intention in the summer of 1656 of interfering with the elections—perhaps because he felt secure in the power of exclusion which he had claimed for himself and the council. Dr. Gardiner adds that when the elections were completed they did not appear so threatening to the Government as was anticipated, for with one exception all the eighteen Major-Generals were returned, together with the members of the council who were not Major-Generals, and he finally comes to the conclusion that the military officers exercised less influence on the elections than has usually been supposed. It may be observed that there is evidence that the Major-Generals did exert in some quarters considerable influence on these elections. It is probable that in certain towns their presence helped to decide the returns.

The electoral struggles at this point appear to have been stubbornly contested, and the very fact that so many of the Major-Generals were returned is at least outstanding. We can still hear across the ages the strife of at least eight hard fought contests[2] which tell us of bitter

[1] It may be mentioned that the struggle for the schoolmaster's position continued until October 29, 1660. There was a series of appointments and dismissals of Mr. Gerrard and Mr. Jennings until finally another man altogether was appointed. One wonders what the ' schollers ' were doing all this time !

[2] Maidstone (*Cal. S. P., Dom. S.*, 1656–7, p. 87); King's Lynn (*House of Commons Journal*, vol. vii. pp. 428 and 441, *et seq.*); Hereford (*H. of C.J.*, p. 432, and *Hist. MSS. Com. Report* 14, App. 2, p. 208); Reading (*Hist. MSS. Report* 11, App. 7, pp. 190–4); Colchester, 1655 (S. R. Gardiner, *Hist. of Protectorate*, chap. xliii. pp. 268–94, and J. H. Round, *Nineteenth Century*, vol. 46, and *English Historical Review*, vol. 15); Westminster (*Thurloe*, vol. v., p. 337—Letter of J. Waddell); Middlesex (*Clarke Papers*, ed. C. H. Firth, vol. 3, p. 70).

contention, and in all these we find the soldier striving to influence the result. One or two illustrations of this strife will perhaps be pardoned. At Hereford the Cromwellian party and the opposition formed up in two separate groups in the Lugg Meadow, and according to a letter of Colonel Harley, the Cromwellian candidates were elected simply because the sheriff was standing nearer to the group which supported them, and by reason of their shouts he could not hear any other voters save those who voted for them. Colonel Harley rode up and insisted that a poll should be taken, with the result that he too was returned; but the sheriff, when the elections of the other members whom he had declared elected were challenged, rode out of the meadow, and the under-sheriff promised the discontented that they should have a poll next year. Thereupon certain of the voters were challenged as to whether they were worth £200 and they confessed they were not.[1] From Maidstone Major-General Kelsey wrote to Cromwell to say that there was 'A very sad spirit in the country. . . . Most of the Cavaliers fell in with the Presbyterians against you and the Government, and the spirit is very bitter against Swordsmen, Decimators, Courtiers etc. . . . Most of those chosen to sit in the coming Parliament are of the same spirit . . . the party give out they will down with Major-Generals. . . . We think a recognition may be so penned as to keep out those that are most dangerous . . . we will stand by you with life and fortune, but there is such perverseness in those chosen that without resolution in you and the Council . . . we shall return to our Egyptian taskmasters.' At Westminster we hear there was a very sad dispute, two slain and very many wounded. It arose between Colonel Grosvenor and one Mr. Lathom. The soldiers came to cry for Grosvenor and the citizens cried 'no swordmen, no mercenary men.' Whereupon they

[1] This account is of course a mere summary. There is a full and interesting account of the proceedings in the source indicated, namely, *Hist. MSS. Report* 14, App. 2, p. 208.

fell together by the ears; the like were at Branford where the anabaptists took away the justices' swords and beat them miserably, insomuch that a regiment of horse was sent to part them. At the Middlesex election twenty people were hurt by reason of the great striving. These examples might easily be multiplied. Various estimates give the number of members secluded from this Parliament and turned back by soldiers posted at the lobby door as ranging from 99 to 160.[1] The returns for London 'were good' according to one letter[2]; from another source we discover that at the time of election all who had been in arms against the State were ordered to depart out of London, Westminster and all places within twenty miles of the same.[3] Now if we compare this information with the change of representation effected by the several charters referred to earlier, a relationship between the two sets of circumstances is discernible. At King's Lynn, for example, there was dispute about the election of 1656, and in July of that year we find the Mayor and aldermen petitioning for a new charter, while at the same time they surrendered their former charter to the Protector. Major-Generals Desborough and Skippon were chosen as representatives for the borough at the election.

There is a significant fact which deserves some slight attention. A glance at the list of towns in the Appendix will show that it is easy to group many of them geographically. Thus Chepstow, Swansea and Abergavenny all lie in a comparatively restricted area in South Wales; Ipswich, King's Lynn, Norwich, Colchester form another group; Chipping Wycombe, Aylesbury, Thame, Hemel Hempstead, Stony Stratford are all comparatively close together. So also we might associate Durham, Leeds, Gateshead; or Gloucester, Salisbury, Blandford and Lyme Regis. With

[1] *Calendar State Papers, Domestic Series*, Sept. 18, 1656; also *Clarke Papers*, ed. C. H. Firth, August 23, 1656.

[2] *Letter of E. Barnes*, Thurloe, 1656, p. 337.

[3] *Calendar State Papers, Domestic Series*, August 28, 1656.

each of these groups it would be possible to connect various other towns which were affected by grants or trade privileges at the Protector's hands: as, for example, the woollen trades in the eastern, northern and south-western areas; groups of companies such as the Gardeners, the Framework Knitters, etc., in the London district. Without further elaboration of this idea it would seem, *primâ facie*, that we have in this classification a suggestion of the activity of the Major-Generals in their several districts, and a comparison of the charter localities with the several districts assigned to the Major-Generals substantiates the theory that their work is largely seen in the application of the towns for charters as well as in the election of 1656.[1] Either by prompting the 'well-affected' party to apply, by indicating to the traders of a district or town the advantages likely to accrue from the acquisition of privileges from the Protector—or even, it may well be, by coercion in some localities—these men were doing the duties appointed to them and, by upholding the new policy, were endeavouring not only to stimulate trade and purify civic life but also to placate the populace. A perusal of the names of the constituencies for which these officers were returned is also instructive. King's Lynn, Middlesex, Guildford, Hampshire, Oxfordshire, Essex, Nottingham, North Riding, Herefordshire, Carmarthen, Woodstock[2] form the list. Some of these towns and districts have, it will be remembered, already figured in these pages as being places affected electorally or as recipients of Cromwellian charters, or both. In any case we may infer that Cromwell, as early as 1656, had perceived what the later Stuarts realised and afterwards practised more extensively, namely, that in the corporate towns there lay the possibility of a more effective control of Parliament. If this were so, then the Protector helped to create the precedent upon which Charles and James sub-

[1] See Professor Rannie's article on the Major-Generals, *English Historical Review*, vol. x.

[2] *Ludlow's Memoirs*, vol. ii. Clarendon Press.

sequently acted. And by carrying the movement to its logical conclusion, we see the Protector helping to place in the hands of these kings the machinery which, perhaps more than any other subsidiary cause, led to the expulsion of James II.

The revulsion of feeling which swept over the country when once the iron grasp of Cromwell was relaxed must account in large measure for the absence of any clue, in the great majority of towns, to any charter granted under the Protectorate. Nor can we wonder at the jubilation of the classes which had so long been subjected to what, to them, was absolutely distasteful. In their minds there was every reason to hasten to forget the years of famine in the anticipation of the fat years that were to come. The symptoms which had made themselves felt so premonitively for many years now appeared without restraint, and the royalist section was in a fever-heat of exultation. This movement, so far as it concerns the charters which Cromwell had bestowed, can be partly estimated by the petitions which appear during the years 1660 and 1661.[1] All those officers who had been ejected from corporations would at once take the necessary steps to be reinstated in their vacated places. We have seen such an instance in our review of the course of events at Reading. There is no evidence as to what happened to the charter granted to that town; but it is possible that in the riot which took place at the meeting of the 17th December 1658 the charter was permanently lost. Certainly the town would never again desire it; and it is almost equally certain that any one possessing it would keep its existence secret.[2] At any rate the charter is not among those which Reading now holds. If the town is aware of its Protectorate charter, its knowledge is derived only from the records of the period. The instance of King's Lynn is not so conclusive. From the evidence of one painstaking historian of the eighteenth century it is clear that as late as

[1] *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series*, 1660 and 1661, *passim*.

[2] Reading preferred to buy a new charter from Charles II at the cost of £229 17*s*. 9*d*. (*Hist. MSS. Com. 11th Report*, App. 7, p. 196).

1788 he obtained information with regard to Oliver's charter 'from MSS. sent him by two eminent merchants in the town.' It would appear, at first sight, that party feeling in King's Lynn did not wax as hot as in other localities; and, if this assumption is correct, it might well be that the charter escaped the changes and chances of those stormy years.[1] In the case of many towns it is indisputable that all knowledge with regard to Cromwell's charters is buried among the ruins of the Cromwellian administration. It is perhaps certain that many towns would openly exult in the destruction of all that savoured of the late régime. So soon as it became apparent which way the tide of political feeling had turned, after Monk's march to London, their hands would turn instinctively to destroy.

There is clear evidence as to this in the instance of one town which may well stand as a type. Some of the contemporary glosses in the town records of Chipping Wycombe are instructive in the insight they give to local feeling. 'In anno 1647 King Charles marched through this town from Casam towards Woburn'; [2] and to this is added in another hand: 'Mr James Big then being Mayor'; and a third person has supplied this sentence: 'and was afterwards beheaded at Whitehall Gate, upon the 30th day of January, A.D. 1648.' Another person still has written: 'To the perpetuall infamy of the English Nation.' This antiphony of opinion illustrates the sentiment of all England besides indicating the access of the two parties to the town records. In 1657 there is an entry to the effect that moneys were raised for the renewing of the town's charter, by anticipating the rent yearly paid by Jerome Gray for the old Guildhall. At the head of this page some royalist has written, 'This is to gain a charter from Oliver in the Rumpers' time, which

[1] The charter is not now in the Municipal Record Room of King's Lynn. Information through the courtesy of Mr. E. M. Beloe, Borough Coroner, King's Lynn.

[2] For these details see *Hist. MSS. Com. 5th Report*, p. 555.

charter was burned on the day our most gracious King Charles II was crowned, whom I pray God to send long to reign.' Below this are written, in the same hand, the words, apparently, 'Rumpers' Charter.'[1] The charter itself has not been preserved.

It is, however, perplexing to consider the total disappearance of not only the charters themselves but also any reference to them in town records. If we take one instance only—that of St. Albans—the situation is clearly illustrated. This town, so far as one can judge from the scanty facts extant, no doubt received a charter from Cromwell. It petitioned for one,[2] and matters went so far in 1656 that the Committee for Charters was instructed to consider the first list of officers under the new municipal circumstances. We also find its mayor and seventy-eight of its inhabitants, earlier in the year, petitioning for improved trade privileges for the neighbouring town of Hemel Hempstead.[3] There is, however, no record of the issue of the charter in the Declared Accounts or the Controlment Book of the Hanaper. It is true, as we have seen, that these records are not intact, and the Charter Rolls for our period do not exist. A charter that was actually issued should be enrolled in Chancery; but the incomplete Hanaper Accounts make no mention of this issue. In fact they only refer to the issue of the municipal charters for Marlborough and Blandford although incidentally they refer to other issues; such, for example, as the exemplification to Gloucester. 'The MS. Chancery Index of Patents ends in the year 1655, and there is no bundle of Privy Seals, King's Bills or Warrants for that date.'[4] But it is the absence of any reference to the charter and the local circumstances which prompted its issue, in the records of St. Albans, which is most strange, unless these records were

[1] *Ibid.* f. 22 b.

[2] *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series*, August 1656 (not indexed).

[3] *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series*, 1655–6, p. 374. See also Appendix to this paper.

[4] *Camden Misc. op. cit.* (Preface).

not diligently kept or else were partially destroyed at the Restoration. The following extract is very interesting: 'Although the town was avowedly Cromwellian there has never been even a suggestion of any return for it locally. . . . Colonel Coxe who lived near was a great friend of Cromwell, and the latter was often here—otherwise there is nothing in the proceedings of that time to differentiate it from a hundred other towns of the same size. I have looked through the local records for that time and find nothing . . . We had no charter, set of constitutions, municipal insignia, grants to the market, appointment of special local officers, which might be included in the query.'[1]

We know also that with the town of Leeds the position is much the same: 'It is to be regretted that the records of the Corporation relating to this period are, with the exception of one insignificant fragment and that not original, irrevocably lost.'[2] Leeds petitioned for another charter in 1661; and its merchants, clothworkers, and others, the inhabitants of the parish, obtained their request in that year. Colchester also has no record of what happened to the Protectorate charter, and all that is known in connection with its contents is derived from the few facts given in 'The Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series.'[3]

The Analytical Index to the Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the Municipal Corporations of England and Wales, under the Act of 1835, mentions that the charters granted by Cromwell were those to Chester, Gateshead, Newport (Isle of Wight), Salisbury and Swansea. Of course this information is totally inadequate, as a glance at the Appendix will prove, but it is serviceable in that it supplies a clue to what the Commissioners found in the local records. Of the Cromwellian charters possibly only those granted to Chester, Swansea, Gloucester, Newport,

[1] Extract from information courteously given by Mr. C. H. Ashdown, Hon. Sec., St. Albans and Herts Architectural and Archæological Society.

[2] See local histories, *passim*.

[3] June 12, 1656.

and perhaps that for the College of Durham,[1] remain in existence at the present time. In addition, one may probably add the charter granted to Gateshead. Through the courtesy of Mr. Swinburne, Town Clerk of Gateshead, we learn that the charter granted by Cromwell to the drapers, etc., of that city, disappeared mysteriously some years ago. Fortunately, however, there is a photograph of it in the Public Library. In 1835 the Commissioners described the Chester charter as being written in English, highly ornamented and in the most perfect state of preservation. Gloucester Corporation has possession of its Cromwellian charter.[2] The following description has been kindly sent by Mr. T. R. Pratt, Town Clerk of Newport (I. of W.): '1655, Oliver, Protector, Westminster, 20 February, 1655. Seal, yellow wax, broken, exemplification of letters patent "Rex (Ed. VI.) Capitaneo Insulae." Parchment in good condition.'[3] With regard to Salisbury it is not known whether the cancelled charter is still preserved among the papers of the House of Commons[4]; but it does not appear among similar instruments in the Records of the Exchequer. All the other charters of the Protector are either lost or hidden away in unknown places. 'Not only are the charters Cromwell granted missing in almost every instance owing to the partial loss of the Patent Rolls and the destruction, locally, of the original, but the circumstances surrounding their grant also remain of necessity obscure, requiring as they do for their elucidation a knowledge of local politics at the time and some acquaintance with the local records preserved in municipal archives. It is certain that in many boroughs most of the books previous to 2 Charles II, 1661, are

[1] There is an imperfect draft of a project of Oliver Cromwell (for erecting a new college at Oxford) amongst the MSS. at Queensberry Place, Kensington, *Hist. MSS. Com. 5th Report*, p. 314.

[2] This information is derived through the courtesy of Mr. G. S. Blakenay, Town Clerk of Gloucester. See also W. H. Stevenson's *Records of Gloucester*, p. 45.

[3] This account comes from P. G. Stone's *Records of Newport.*

[4] *Camden Misc., loc. cit.*

destroyed, and those now existing commence with the acts of the Commissioners under that Statute.' [1]

Considering this state of affairs, it is a matter for congratulation that we have in the case of Salisbury ample details of what ensued in that city upon Cromwell's death, and that at Swansea a piece of marvellous good fortune added to a diligent and intelligent search brought back to the light of day the actual charters of the Protector. They are now at the Guildhall in Swansea. The charter of 1655 is written on four stout skins tied together with string. The laces and the seal are gone and the margin of several skins has been cut, otherwise the document is in good condition except that some ink or reddish liquid has been spilt over the sheets. The charter has a good portrait of the Protector in armour drawn within the initial 'O.' The 1658 charter has been subjected to rough usage. 'It is much crumpled and stained, and on the top the margin is cut away beyond the initial word Oliver, but on the whole it may be said to be in sound condition and the writing legible.' In this charter the seal has gone, but some small fragments of wax yet remain in the folds of the tawny and white laces. Both charters are written in English. The story of the recovery of these charters is extremely interesting and deserves to be more widely known. It is told in the book from which this information of the Swansea charters is obtained.[2] During the five centuries between 1200 and 1700, Swansea had received nine charters. Two of these were from the Lords Marchers (the De Braose charters), five from kings, and two from Cromwell. For a long period four of these were missing from the muniment room of the Guildhall at Swansea, namely one of a Lord Marcher, one of King John, and both those granted by Oliver. It appeared from the records that Cromwell's

[1] J. H. Round, *Nineteenth Century*, vol. 46; *English Historical Review*, vol. 15.

[2] Charters granted to Swansea. G. G. Francis (Introductory chapter and *passim*). Mr. Francis has edited these Protectorate Charters with very full and valuable notes upon the charters in their bearing upon the History of Swansea.

charters had been taken by Mr. Gabriel Parker when, about 1730, he had the Corporation papers in his hands as solicitor carrying on some litigation for the borough which caused the town great difficulty, both in the settlement and in obtaining the return of the municipal documents. Mr. Francis being in possession of these facts commenced a long and anxious search, and was eventually rewarded for his perseverance by the discovery 'amongst a mass of old papers in a loft over a stable at Cantreff near Brecon,' of the two Protectorate charters. After some bargaining with a reverend gentleman named Powell, he purchased them for £12, and had the satisfaction of restoring them to their proper custody. With the help of these existing charters the copy of the Salisbury charter, and the details forthcoming from the 'Calendar of State Papers,'[1] together with the several precedents given at the end of W. Sheppard's book 'Of Corporations,'[2] there need not be much doubt as to the nature of the Protectorate issues. It may well be that the muniment chests of some of our old towns have in their peaceful keeping further treasures for future revelation; but to search through these would be a long and arduous task. All our information for the present comes from such sources as those already indicated together with local history—often a painfully meagre supply.

Two different seals were used in turn for the authentication of the Commonwealth charters, and we know that Cromwell as Protector also used two seals.[3] The earlier type was employed for the charter granted to Eton College in September 1655; the latter for Gloucester City Charter in August 1657. The latter seal was also employed by Richard Cromwell. There is said to be little difference between these two seals. The former is bigger and in the latter Cromwell's sword is longer. Thomas Simon, 'an artist of rare capacity and ability made them.' Why the

[1] *E.g.* in the instance of Abergavenny notes of practically the whole of the charter are supplied. *See* Appendix.

[2] *Press Mark, B.M.E.* 1912 (2). [3] Wyon's *Great Seals of England, op. cit.*

second seal should have been made is beyond explanation. Besides the differences already mentioned, it is said that there are other minute variations, but so minute as to require close inspection to detect them.

It will be instructive to turn now to the events in Swansea and Salisbury which transpired subsequently to Cromwell's death. At Swansea there is no notice in the Corporation records that the burgess mentioned in the charter of 1658 was ever elected, although William Foxwist (formerly connected with the municipal life of St. Albans) represented the town in Richard Cromwell's Parliament. Prior to the Restoration the Corporation simply set aside the charter, and at Michaelmas 1659 reverted to the old order of things and bestowed the title of portreeve upon William Jones. In 1661 the portreeve excluded in 1647 reassumed office; but the records make no mention of his re-election. He had for colleagues at least nine of the aldermen nominated in the charter of 1656; but there are three prominent names absent, Philip Jones, Major-General Roland Dawkins and Matthew David. Of these men two were of course well known as ardent supporters of Cromwell and were highly esteemed by him. Philip Jones sat in Cromwell's House of Peers as Philip, Lord Jones, and became Comptroller of His Highness' household. The only trace of all the privileges granted to the town in the 1656 charter is Cromwell's May Fair, which is still used.[1] This fact illustrates the dependent nature of the municipalities and their indifference to their individual interests. A perusal of the Protectorate charters granted to Swansea shows that Cromwell granted the town considerable power in self-government, but it was apparently willing to set all these aside on its own initiative and relapse into its old state. The country was not ready for Cromwell and failed to appreciate his administration. Swansea received no other charter till the reign of James II, when it slavishly surrendered its former charters and spent £100 in the process.

[1] This is interesting because James's charter (1685) ignored it and re-established three others which were allowed for by the bye-laws of 1584.

The charter it obtained from James, says one writer,[1] 'forms an admirable key to the causes of James's loss of his throne and the political changes involved in his mistakes and misfortunes . . . If the burgesses carelessly accepted his charter the King by an order of council could at any time have suspended their privileges or inflicted heavy fines upon them.'

There was a somewhat different attitude at Salisbury; and a study of the long struggle which had preceded the issue of the Protectorate charter would lead one to anticipate an unwillingness to relinquish the privileges so dearly purchased. The Corporation shows itself loath to lose at least one of the grants made at its request by Cromwell, and they gave good reasons for their desire to retain the acquisition. The citizens do not appear to have taken any leading part in the events which followed after the death of the Protector; but on August 2, 1659, the Mayor and Commonalty were authorised by the remnant of the Long Parliament to act under their former charter and surrender the new charter to the House to be cancelled.[2] It is, perhaps, to be inferred that the city was uneasy as to the future and desired reassurance in the fluctuating circumstances. At a meeting of the Council, held on August 11, the Corporation seemingly acquiesced in this act, and Cromwell's charter was definitely declared null and void. Moreover, the Council readmitted to its ranks some sixteen aldermen and eighteen assistants and other municipal officers under the terms of its old charter. From knowledge of what had transpired earlier in this period one may perhaps surmise that among these men who now resumed their civic status there would be a large proportion of Presbyterians.

It is to be noticed that while 'our well-beloved' William Stone lost his office of Mayor in yielding place to Christopher Batt, who had been one of the aldermen nominated under Oliver's issue, yet the Recorder, Henry Eyre, was reappointed

[1] G. G. Francis, *op. cit.*

[2] Hoare's *Wiltshire*, chapter xxxvii. The Town Records of Salisbury are ample for this period.

to his office. The Independents were still a strong element in the municipal situation.

The Corporation again took up its old request and solicited the renewal of Oliver's grant of St. Nicholas' Hospital on the ground that during recent years its disposal by them had been for the 'great relief and maintenance of the Poor of the City, wherewith they were overgrown and burdened by the great decay of trade.' The grant of this hospital had figured largely in Oliver's charter and it was accompanied by stringent rules for the control of its Master and other officers, its accounts, regulations and income. This income was to be devoted 'towards the reliefe of the pore of the said Cittie.' This renewed assertion of the poverty of the city confirms the statement of earlier years that trade had dwindled in the locality, while the fact that the grant had been for the relief and maintenance of the poor bears testimony that, even in the short time the Protector's charter had been in force, it had produced a beneficial result so far as the poor were concerned. The municipal records give evidence of a desperate struggle between the parties. At the next mayoral election the result of the poll perhaps indicates the tone of the city. Of the five candidates put forward for the office Thomas Abbott was chosen. This is another of the fifteen chosen by Oliver as aldermen. Furthermore it is to be noted that the appointment of the officers for the Hospital of St. Nicholas had been placed in the hands of the Corporation (the Mayor, eight or more aldermen, and twelve or more assistants for the election of Master) 'to elect some able, knowing, and sufficient person to be Master and Governor.' Under Cromwell's charter the Corporation elected two of their aldermen to the offices of Master and Steward of the Hospital, namely John Ivie the elder and John Ivie the younger. It is significant that these men were again elected in the altered circumstances.

The name of Antony Ashley Cooper now becomes more prominent in the quickly moving events of the time. He

had played a leading part in the local drama, and with his keen political acumen he saw the direction of the impending storm. He urged the Mayor to take shelter and they two repaired to London to render homage to the King. Cromwell's charter was treated with contumely. The Sword and Cap of Maintenance granted under its provisions were sold; the Sword of State was ultimately broken at the Whipping Post. We have to imagine the dejection of the late triumphant Independents and their gloomy anticipations of the future. The Bishop came back to Salisbury. Robert Hyde was replaced in his position as Recorder. Before the Corporation Act was executed the Mayor and Commonalty were summoned before the Commissioners for Charitable Uses to give account of the purposes to which they had applied the various 'benefactions, gifts and legacies.' When that sinister Act came into force the city naturally experienced disaster. Some thirteen officers were summarily ejected from their positions. Ten others were required to take the oath, and upon refusal were dismissed from municipal service. On the day of their dismissal eight other corporate officers were discharged for no apparent reason. In all, eight new aldermen and twenty-two assistants, besides subordinate officers, were appointed to fill the vacant places. Dr. Gardiner tells us that the Corporation of Salisbury petitioned for a charter from Cromwell to obtain confirmation of the purchase by the city of the property of the Dean and Chapter whilst at the same time they wished for a diminution of their numbers on the ground that the trade of the place had decayed.[1] It seems legitimate to say, however, that at Salisbury the Independents had won another victory. The Presbyterians there had menaced the 'well-affected party,' and as a consequence the Independents (under the clause for reducing the number of aldermen) excluded many of their Presbyterian brethren. There is extant a letter from a Mr. Stephen, who complained

[1] *Gardiner's History*, vol. 3, chapter xliii. p. 292.

that although he had been active in acquiring power and privilege for the city without any charge or cost save only to himself, yet he was turned out and not even referred to by the Mayor in the business of the city. His place was bestowed upon Mr. Eyre, 'who will punish sin, suppress ale-houses and administer justice with greater courage than he himself had done.'

A review of the petitions for the years 1660 and 1661 is interesting, for by their help we actually come in touch with the discontent of the Royalist Party, with the presence, on the municipal bodies, of their political opponents, and with their desire to effect an alteration of the conditions established under the Protector. As we have seen, no time was lost in the case of some towns to effect this change. But the warrant for the Act of Reservation to the Crown of nomination of the first officers was dated May 7, 1661. The Act against Promiscuous Petitioning (13 Charles II) [1] had either not yet been passed or else its influence had not yet had time to make itself felt. The Licensing Act was issued in 1662, so that the instances supplied in the 'Calendar of State Papers' for the intervening period assume considerable interest. They are not too numerous, but yet are sufficient for our purpose. We find Denbigh, Droitwich and Doncaster applying for confirmation of their charters as a reward for the suffering which they had endured by reason of their loyalty. St. Edmund's Bury asked for a renewal of its Charters of Incorporation with the appointment of such corporate officers as the King should see fit. 'During the late troubles things have been done not justifiable by their former patents and many of the present Corporation are not duly elected so that their Government is exposed to danger.' The Mayor of Wallingford petitioned for an 'order to restore those persons still surviving, who in 1647 were ejected from the Corporation by ordinance of the pretended Parliament, for loyalty, when officers and soldiers of the Parliamentary army and others were introduced . . .' He also asked for

[1] C. G. Robertson, *Select Acts*, p. 5.

the annulling of all burgesses elected since 1647, that the government of the town might be rescued from slavery and tyranny. There is a request that factious aldermen may be ejected at Norwich: the Printers and Stocking-Weavers desired the removal of conditions established under Oliver. The Shoemakers of Salisbury complained that the late mayor had detained their charter because they would not receive orders from Cromwell. Finally, we see the commencement of the work of ejection in a communication from Lord Lovelace and five other Commissioners for Regulating Corporations in Berkshire to the effect that they have turned out of the Corporation and secured three aldermen of Newbury, who had refused to take the oath prescribed by Parliament.[1]

APPENDIX

A List of Towns that applied for, or received Charters and Grants under the Protectorate

ABBREVIATIONS

(Reference is to the 'Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, Interregnum,' unless otherwise stated.)

H. of C.J. = House of Commons Journal.
B.C.H. = Book of the Controlment of the Hanaper in Chancery.
D.A. = Declared Accounts, Audit Office.
R. = Roll.
B. = Bundle.

Abergavenny.	Committee for Charters to consider petition. November 13, January 6, July, September 29, 1656–7.
Aylesbury.	Petition of inhabitants for a renewal of charter. March 1656–7, April 1, 1658.

[1] For further instances see *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series*, for years 1660 and 1661 *passim*.

Aberdeen.	See under Glasgow.
Anglesea.	Petition for a weekly market and five yearly fairs. December 1, 1657.
Bath.	Grant of Hospital of St. John Baptist. 1656–7; B.C.H. 664, May 1657; D.A., R. 147, B. 1378.
Blandford.	Committee to consider charter. November 13–18, June 1655–6, Patent of Incorporation, B.C.H. 664, February 26, 1656; D.A., R. 147, B. 1378, 1656–7.
Bromyard.	Petition for three yearly fair days. July 5, 1655–6, September 25, 1655–6, July 1, 1656–7.
Cambridge.	Patent to Master and Fellows of Emanuel College. D.A., R. 140, B. 1377, 1654.
Chipping Wycombe.	Committee to consider draft of charter. November, January, February 1656–7; Hist. MSS. Comm. Report V.
Chepstow.	Committee to speak with Governor of Chepstow (Major-General Berry); Heads of Charter prepared by Sheppard, December 1656.
Chichester.	Grant to Mayor and aldermen. B.C.H. December 1656. (Price paid was £8 4s. 0*d.*)
Colchester.	June, August, September 1655–6; April and August 1656–7; Records of Colchester.
Chatham.	Petition of Commissioner Pett. August 1656–7. Grant of Hospital of St. Bartholomew, D.A., R. 144, B. 1377, 1655–6.
Chester.	Exemplification at request of Edward Bradshaw. March 1654, B.C.H. 663. Petition from Mayor and Council for Hospital. February 1656–7; August 1657. See under Newport, I. of Wight.
Cranley.	Grant for two fairs. B.C.H. 664, May 15, 1657; D.A., R. 147, B. 1378, 1656–7.
Durham.	Petition for erection of a college. Hutchinson's 'History,' vol. i. (which contains full text of the charter); Tracts relating to Durham, 1302–21; Perpetuity for college at Durham, B.C.H. 664, May 27, 1657; D.A., R. 147, B. 1378, 1656–7.

Edinburgh.	See under Glasgow. Petition of Robert Leighton for a grant, August 25, 1657. He refers to grants already made to Aberdeen and Glasgow.
Eton.	Wyon's 'Great Seals of England'; September 1658.
Gateshead.	Committee to report on charter (Longstaffe's article in *Gentleman's Magazine*, vol. xiii. for 1862). December and February 1656–7; March 1657–8. (The last date refers to a petition of the well-affected of Gateshead concerning the government of the town.) See under Newport, Isle of Wight.
Guernsey.	Committee to consider charter. July, August 1656.
Gloucester.	Petition of Mayor and Council for grant of Cathedral. July 1656. Exemplification at request of Mayor and Burgesses. B.C.H. 664, August 4, 1657; D.A., R. 147, B. 1378, 1656–7.
Glasgow.	Petition of Patrick Gillespie, Principal of University, for special grants and issue of a new charter. March 1656–7. A charter at Aberdeen is dated June 18, 1658. Robert Leighton obtained a special grant of £200 for Edinburgh University. A grant was issued for erecting a College of Physicians in Scotland, B.C.H. 664, April 13, 1637; D.A., R. 147, B. 1378, 1656–7. See also Acts of Scottish Parlt. vol. vi. part ii. *passim*; *Fasti Aberdonensis*, printed for Spalding Club, 1854; *Fasti Academise Mariscallanæ Aberdonensis*, edited by P. J. Anderson; Acts and ordinances of the Interregnum, collected and edited by C. H. Firth and R. S. Rait.
Hatfield Chace.	Petition for incorporation, August 1656–7.
Hemel Hempstead.	Grant for three fairs yearly. B.C.H. March 4, 1656–7; D.A., R. 147, B. 1378, 1656–7. Also 'Calendar of State Papers, Domestic

Hemel Hempstead.	'Series, Interregnum,' vol. for 1655-6, p. 374.
Ipswich.	Exemplification at request of Mayor, etc. D.A., R. 140, B. 1377, September 1653–September 1654.
Ilford.	Grant of the Hospital of the Blessed Mary. D.A., R. 147, B. 1378, 1656–7.
Jersey.	Petition against a Patent granted in 1654–5. August 30, 1655–6.
Leominster.	Petition of John Patshall, Bailiff, for reduction in number of officers of corporation from 24 to 13 or 7, 'because there are few well-affected.'
	New officers to be named by Protector. Complaining of ale-houses, vice, and wickedness. December 16, 1656–7.
Leeds.	Petition for new charter. December, January, 1656–7.
Leicester.	Letters Patent to all the inhabitants of the Borough and Town of Leicester. Given at Westminster under the seal of the duchy of Lancaster. Hist. MSS. Comm. Report VIII.
	Petition for grant of Hospital. H. of C. J., November 21, 1656.
Lynn Regis, Norfolk.	Petition of Mayor and Council for renewal of charter. July 1656. 'History of King's Lynn,' by B. Mackerell.
Lyme Regis, Dorset.	Special grant to Mayor and Burgesses. B.C.H. 663; D.A., R. 142, B. 1377, Sept. 1654–Sept. 1655. (Price paid for privilege, 20*s.* 3*d.*)
London.	Perpetuity to Framework Knitters. B.C.H. 664, June 1657; D.A., R. 147, B. 1378, 1656–7.
	Commission to Lord Mayor for conservation of fish in the Thames. B.C.H. 664, Sept. 16, 1657.
	Patent for special grant to Lord Mayor and commonalty. D.A., R. 144, B. 1377, 1655–6. (Pardon by patent.)
	Petition of Master, Wardens and Company of Gardeners of London. May 22, 1656.

London.	Commission to Lord Mayor of London. D.A., R. 147, B. 1378, 1656–7. (Pardon by charter.)
	Proposed charter of incorporation for Eastland Merchants. June 1656.
	Grant to Lord Mayor to purchase coal. 4th Report Deputy Keeper, appendix ii. 1655.
	Petition of Needlemakers for incorporation. Aug. 7, 1656–7.
	Petition of Master, Wardens, etc., of the Parish Clerks of London, Westminster and Southwark for alteration in their charter. Feb. 4, 1656–7.
	Petition of professors of music for a College of Music. Feb. 19, 1656–7.
	Merchant Adventurers. Confirmation of charter. Cal. S. P., Dom. Ser., May 13, 1656. Whitlocke, March 1656.
	Market in Lincoln's Inn Fields. Whitlocke, March 1656.
Maidenhead.	Committee to consider new charter. October 1656–7.
Marlborough.	Petition from Mayor and Burgesses. December, January, March 1656–7; Committee to consider charter.
	Grant of charter. B.C.H. 664, May 5, 1657; D.A., R. 147, B. 1378, 1656–7.
Norwich.	Petition of Worsted Weavers. H. of C. J., November 1656; Cal. S. P., Dom. Ser., 1655–6, p. 201; Sheppard 'Of Corporations'; Acts of 1653 and 1656. Report of Committee on petition of inhabitants of the Close concerning a new charter and report of counsel learned and John Archer on the charter for Norwich, February 1657–8.
North Molton.	Perpetuity for a fair. B.C.H. 664, July 11, 1657; D.A., R. 147, B. 1378, 1656–7
Newport, Isle of Wight.	Exemplification at request of Mayor. D.A., R. 144, B. 1377, 1655–6. Report of Commissioners of Municipal Corporations. They refer also to charters granted by

Newport, Isle of Wight.	the Protector to Chester, Gateshead, Salisbury, Swansea.
Newcastle.	Petition of Wherrymen for incorporation. Longstaffe's article in *Gentlemen's Magazine*, vol. xiii. for 1862.
Northampton.	Grant of Hospital of St. John Baptist. D.A., R. 144, B. 1377, 1655–6.
Ottley.	Grant for a fair. April 18, 1657 ; B.C.H. 664.
Oxford.	License in Mortmain of St. John the Baptist College. B.C.H. 664, March 26, 1657. Imperfect draft for erecting a new college at Oxford among MSS. at Queensberry Place, Kensington. Hist. MSS. Com., vol. v. p. 314.
Reading.	Grant of a new charter. Hist. MSS. Comm. vol. ii. 6 and 7. Petition for new charter, April 1656.
Ripon.	Grant of Hospital of St. Magdalen and St. John. D.A., R. 144, B. 1377, 1655–6.
St. Albans.	Committee to consider list of names of persons to be inserted in new charter. August 1656.
St. Austin (Cornwall)	Grant for one market and two yearly fairs. B.C.H., 664, Sept. 16, 1657 ; D.A., R. 147, B. 1378, 1656–7.
St. Briavell.	Exemplification at request of inhabitants. D.A., R. 150, B. 1378, 1658–9.
Salisbury.	Salisbury Records supplied in Hoare's 'History of South Wilts'; Salisbury Charter, edited by H. Hall. Report of Commissioners on Municipal Charters. See under Newport, Isle of Wight.
Scotland.	College of Physicians. B.C.H., 664, April 13, 1657 ; D.A., R. 147, B. 1378, 1656–7. See under Glasgow, Edinburgh, Aberdeen.
Smethwick.	Grant for two fairs. March 26, 1657 ; B.C.H. 664, D.A., R. 147, B. 1378, 1656–7.
Swansea.	Issue of two new charters. G. G. Francis's Collection of Swansea Charters. Patent granted to Mayor of Swansea. D.A., R. 144, B. 1377, 1655–6. See also under Newport, Isle of Wight.

Stony Stratford.	Petition for Market. December, March, 1657–8.
Sudbury, Suffolk.	Petition for renewal of charter. August 6, 1657.
Taunton.	Petition of Clothiers, Weavers, etc. April 10, 1656.
Thame.	Petition of inhabitants concerning market for Aylesbury. March 1656–7.
Thirske.	Petition for alteration of markets. B.C.H. 664, April 30, 1657; D.A., R. 147, B. 1378, 1656–7.
Thorne.	Grant of a weekly market. B.C.H. 665, December, 1658.
Uxbridge.	Petition of Burgesses for confirmation of former liberties and further franchises. Attorney-General to prepare draft charter, Dec. 24, 1657. Referred to Committee for Petitions.
Wakefield.	Petition to regulate market. July 8, 1656–7.
West Riding.	Bill for Incorporation of Makers and Workers of Mixed Woollen Goods. (*Mercurius Politicus*, Dec. 11–18, 1656.) H. of C. Journal (for other incorporations such as that of Cloth Workers in Exeter and Devon and Norfolk, Merchant Adventurers, etc., see this same source).
Wells.	Petition as to Cathedral, July 1656–7. Another petition, March 23, 1657.
Wisbeach.	Grant for fortnightly fair. B.C.H. 664, July 1657; D.A., R. 147, B. 1378, 1656–7.
Whitehaven.	Grant to Town and Port. B.C.H. Dec. 18, 1656. (Price paid was £8 9*s.* 0*d.*)
Woodstock.	Report on Charter. August 1656.
Woworth (Surrey).	Grant of Fair and Market on Shamley Green. B.C.H. 664, May 15, 1657; D.A., R. 147, B. 1378.

The sources indicated also give instances of special grants made to individuals under the Protectorate. A few of these have been selected as types.

A grant to Thomas Banks and Antony Foster for the trans-

portation of all wool cloths for thirty-one years. December 8, 1658. B.C.H. (ending Michaelmas, 1659).

A Patent granted by the Lord Protector to the Society of the Governors and Assistants of London of the new plantations in Ulster in Ireland. Pardon by charter. April 6, 1656. B.C.H. 664 ; D.A., R. 147, B. 1378.

The like to Colonel John Howson of several lands in Ireland in perpetuity with other things. (£16 18*s.* 0*d.*) April 6, 1656. B.C.H. 664 ; D.A., R. 147, B. 1378.

(Duplicates of these charters were issued on July 11 and April 25, 1657 respectively at the price of 20*s.* 4*d.* each. B.C.H. 664.)

Patent to John Barrington. D.A., R. 150, B. 1378.

(The Barringtons were relations of Oliver Cromwell. See *English Historical Review*, vol. vi., ' Cromwell's Kinsfolk.')

Grant of one-third of any discoveries that he or they may make to William Murford of King's Lynn in Norfolk and his heirs in discharge of debt owing to him from the Commonwealth and in recompense for faithful services. Fifth Report, Deputy Keeper, appendix ii., 1657.

Grants to Christopher Packe, Thomas Foote, Thomas Andrews, Aldermen of London, out of moneys to be brought in under Act for preventing multiplicity of buildings in London. *Ibid.*

Grant to Lord Launcelot to purchase fee farm rent of Hatfield Chase. *Ibid.*

A Patent of Creation of the dignity of a baronet granted to Sir John Claypole (privilege). D.A., R. 147, B. 1378.

The like to Thomas Howard, Esq. £15 3*s.* 4*d.*

THE EASTLAND COMPANY IN PRUSSIA, 1579–1585

By Professor ADAM SZELAGOWSKI and N. S. B. GRAS, Ph.D. (Harvard).

Read December 21, 1911

VERY little is known about the early history of English mercantile venture into the far Eastland. Although some ambitious traders from this island steered their course through the Sound in the fourteenth century, or earlier, and in the fifteenth century seem to have aspired to some degree of common action, it remains true that, previous to the foundation of the Eastland Company in 1579, there was no important body of English merchants organised to trade in the Baltic.

It is intended here to focus attention upon the early struggles of this company in Prussia, and particularly in the town of Elbing, where was carried on a contest similar to that maintained in the West by the Merchant Adventurers.

Elbing, situated at the mouth of the Vistula, was, in the second half of the sixteenth century, but a shadow of its former greatness, and its citizens recalled with regret the time when their trade had equalled that of Dantzic. Elbing, like Bruges a century earlier, saw itself threatened by a change in the channel of the river—a change which had already spelt partial decay and might mean total ruin. But, enemy though Nature seemed, she was not more patently adverse to the fortunes of Elbing than the neighbouring Dantzic. In this unequal contest with an overshadowing rival, Elbing saw in the king of Poland an ally as willing as able; for the Polish crown had found the proud and arbitrary republic of Dantzic traders little

inclined to serve its ends or to bow to its will. As an earnest of support, both Sigismund Augustus and Stephen Bathory published edicts, by which they sought to raise Elbing from a state of decay. The latter, shortly after his election, went so far as to invite foreign merchants to choose their homes and set up their warehouses in Elbing.[1] When, therefore, at a later date, during its quarrel with Dantzic, Elbing maintained that the idea of the establishment of the English company within its walls really emanated from the Polish king, there was much force in the contention.

During the rebellion of Dantzic in 1577, Stephen Bathory ordered his secretary, Peter Kloczewski, to take the measurement of the gulf of Svieza. The king's project was, if possible, to restore the port of Elbing.[2] But the citizens of Dantzic, seeing in this a supreme danger, conceived the idea of preventing it for ever by blocking up the entrance to the gulf. They held their hand only through the fear that such a step would injure Königsberg, and decided that it would be safer to destroy the entrance of the little Elbing river. This attempt of Dantzic on Elbing cost the Elbingers more than sixty ships and about 100,000 florins.[3]

Elbing was to be more successful in another direction. As early as the latter half of 1578, and in the first months of 1579, it began to negotiate with English merchants with a view to their settlement within its borders. And at about this time, the magistrates of Dantzic complained that Elbing took the liberty of granting freedom of trade to foreign merchants, which in its eyes was not only a detriment to Elbingers themselves, and contrary to Prussian rights, but quite contrary to the rules and the spirit of the Hanseatic Union.[4] But no matter what the ostensible motives were there can be no doubt that the 'Pearl of Poland' kept

[1] W. Behring, *Beiträge zur Geschichte Elbings* (1900), 4.
[2] Behring, 6.
[3] Behring, 11.
[4] Royal Archives, Dantzic: *Acta Hanseatica*, 108,

always in mind the undoubted loss which would ensue from the establishment of an English staple in a near-by town. For up to this time, English merchants trading in the Baltic had made Dantzic their headquarters, though, so far as is known, they had not organised as a trading company. Elbing, then, in bidding for the English trade, was threatening the coffers of Dantzic and the purses of its citizens.

It is an interesting coincidence that at this very time, the ten years period [1] of settlement of the Merchant Adventurers at Hamburg was elapsing. Hamburg had been the first Hanseatic town to withdraw from the general practice of excluding foreign merchants from the greater part of local trade. There was then a natural fear in the minds of the magistrates of Dantzic that Elbing, like Hamburg, being governed by the calculation of its own interests, would follow this example and admit the English merchants who were clamouring for a foothold in the Baltic.

The line of cleavage between the rival towns was deeper now than even before. Dantzic could reckon on the support of a large part of the Hanse against the English—the common foe of the league. Elbing turned instinctively to Poland and hoisted the banner of national rights, which gave to the Prussian towns, as well as to the nobility, the freedom of concluding commercial treaties with other maritime nations, subject to the consent of the king and the estates of the realm.

True to its international, and even anti-national, position, Dantzic took the obvious course of enlisting foreign allies. Denmark had been her friend, and to Denmark Dantzic now turned. Mathias Möller was sent to point out the losses and injuries which would inevitably ensue to the Baltic towns, if English monopolists, as they were called, were suffered to gain a footing in Elbing. Frederic II of Denmark, however, was too prudent to pick a quarrel with

[1] 1567–77; actually terminating in 1578.

England and Poland at one and the same time. So his answer was a curt refusal. As yet, he saw no signs that the commercial enterprises of the English would damage, in any way, either himself or his subjects. If in the future he should see that his tolls were injured, then he would take the necessary steps to protect his interests. Besides, it might be expected that the attempt of the English merchants to find a staple in the Baltic would, as heretofore, end in failure. While in this frame of mind, Frederic could not be induced even to send a letter to Queen Elizabeth on the subject.[1]

It was in November of the year 1579, about three months after the grant of a charter by Elizabeth, that the following English merchants arrived in Elbing: George Rucks, Robert Walton, Matthew Gray, Thomas Gorney, and John Bricks. They lost no time in declaring to the magistracy of Elbing, in the name of the newly chartered company, that with the assurances of the goodwill of the town, they would bring in their wares.[2] They were at once welcomed to Elbing; and, practically, from this time dates the staple of the Eastland Company at Elbing, though some time was to elapse before final terms were reached between the company and the Elbingers, and before the king gave his sanction to the pact. A working agreement seems soon to have been reached. The English stipulated that they should be guaranteed freedom of trade and navigation, and exemption from new tolls, and they reserved to themselves the right of withdrawing from the town in case of oppressive measures injurious to their liberty or their trade. To all these conditions Elbing agreed, with the reservation of the dues at the mouth of the river, which it shared conjointly with Königsberg.[3]

In focusing attention upon the actual events taking place at Elbing, we should not forget the larger arena of

[1] *Hanseatica*, 108.
[2] *Cf.* Record Office, *State Papers, Foreign*, Poland, i. 4.
[3] *Köln. Inv.*, ii. p. 617.

struggle, for this was a contest in which a great part of western Europe was to be involved, and in which at this time there were two storm-centres other than Elbing—England itself and Hamburg.

In November, 1577, the period of the residence of the Merchant Adventurers at Hamburg was to have come to an end, and the Hanse regarded this as an opportune moment for beginning the final contest for its privileges in England. In particular, it wanted the heavy additional duties, imposed upon the trade of its members, withdrawn; and the licence system, which was ruining its foothold in England, entirely swept away. The English government on its part left no stone unturned in its efforts to oust the Hanseatic merchants from certain branches of English commerce: notably, coast transportation and trade between English and foreign ports, other than Hanseatic towns. And it is worthy of note that, whilst this scheme of defence was being carried out at home, England was successfully carrying the battle into the Hanseatic towns themselves.

Fully conscious of the impending dangers, the more eminent members of the Hanse began to consider ways and means of resistance and retaliation. Two among their number stood out pre-eminent: Henry Sudermann, a native of Germany and syndic of the Hanse, and George Lisemann, a Prussian and secretary of the Steelyard in London. On these two leaders fell the brunt of the struggle for privilege and even existence in England. Remaining at the centre of the Hanse, Sudermann organised resistance and counselled unity of action, whilst Lisemann in London directed the negotiations with the English government. And whilst the former sought to enlist the aid of the emperor, the latter endeavoured to obtain the support of his superior, the Polish king.

The Hanse, in the year 1578, had addressed a petition to the king of Poland through the interposition of Lübeck and the Prussian district, asking him to take the affairs of the League under his protection and to intercede on its

behalf with the English queen. This petition contained first of all a statement of the rights and privileges of the Hanseatic League, couched in these words: 'It is known to everyone by whose consent, and on what principle, the sea-towns called the German Hanse, formed, centuries ago, their renowned league, so that, by keeping peace at sea, they might secure free intercourse, which is so useful to different states and nations, uniting them together by their mutual interests in the export and import trade. For the advancement of this trade certain rights and offices were given, in conformity with justice and conducive to the public benefit.' On the Hanse depended not only the wealth of the sea-towns, but also the prosperity of the neighbouring kingdoms. Foreign kings had granted it many privileges, and prominent among them various English sovereigns, by whose permission the Hanseatic *collegium* was set up in England. But of late these privileges had become so uncertain that the existence of the League itself was threatened, and, indeed, the prosperity of Prussia and of the whole Polish kingdom. To prevent such a catastrophe, the Hanseatic towns had conferred and taken steps for the general good. They had likewise requested the towns within the Prussian district to confer. And now these towns, as loyal subjects of the Polish king, hoped that he would write to the English queen and ask her to allow his Polish subjects, as also the rest of the towns, to enjoy again the privileges and immunities of their fathers, especially in the export cloth trade.[1]

The reply of Stephen Bathory was sympathetic. He would not willingly stand aside whilst his loyal towns suffered injury. And what was more, he even wrote to Queen Elizabeth on behalf of his subjects, and of the Hanse in general, with respect to the export of English cloth and the obnoxious system of licences.[2]

The object of the king in breaking a lance on behalf of

[1] *Kölner Inventar* (ed. K. Höhlbaum), ii. p. 518 (1903); *Hanseatica*, 108.
[2] *Köln. Inv.*, ii. pp. 148, 154.

the Hanseatic League, was patent to all. He needed the assistance of the Hanse towns in the second of his great wars—this time against Russia. He needed their money and their ships. And with this in view, he wrote to the citizens of Dantzic to persuade other Hanseatic towns to join him in this enterprise.

Dantzic, on its part, was eager to do the king's bidding if only it could get back its privileges and immunities in England, and oust the English from Elbing. But Dantzic found it not an easy matter to induce other members of the League, especially Lübeck, to consent to the obstruction of the navigation of the Narva—an enterprise which was part and parcel of Stephen Bathory's campaign. Unfortunately, the other towns distrusted Dantzic, believing that it was consulting the interests of its own trade, rather than trying to aid the Polish king against Muscovy. This was a natural position, especially when it is borne in mind that, some years before, during the Seven Years War, Dantzic had advocated similar measures at the Hanseatic congresses.

In spite of this difficulty, Dantzic was unceasing in its activity. Its agents arrived at the congress of the Hanse at Lübeck, in August, 1579, supplied with proofs of their disinterestedness in the form of royal letters. And for whatever success was attained at this assembly, to George Lisemann belongs the chief credit. Both at public meetings and privately, he was able to persuade the delegates, at least in part, that the Hanseatic cause would have a staunch friend in Stephen Bathory. But Lübeck proved the stumbling-block; for not only did it decline to abstain from the Narva trade for longer than a year, but made the hard bargain that it would do this only on condition that the Danish king would close the Sound to the ships of other nations; further, it refused the financial aid which the Polish king so much needed.[1] It was, moreover, unfortunate for the success of the proposed alliance that

[1] *Köln. Inv.*, ii. p. 588.

the soul of the early negotiations, Lisemann, was obliged to leave for England before the congress had proceeded very far in its deliberations.[1]

But Lübeck and Dantzic were one in their desire for more violent measures against England, and for severe reprisals on English trade. It was urged by Lisemann that the Rhine trade, or at the very least, access to the Prussian towns, be closed to the English, and that retortive tolls be levied on English merchandise.[2] This was a bold policy, and it contrasted strangely with the actual events of the period.

Much greater unanimity was reached in the discussion of the demands of the English queen, who insisted on having English merchants put on a footing of equality in all Hanseatic staple towns. The alleged grounds for the refusal of the English position was that it would be an unequal bargain. In return for privileges in England, which meant practically only London, the Hanse would be throwing open all its ports to the English merchants.

The upshot of the congress was that instructions were drawn up with a view to common action. In the first place, the English staple at Stade (to which the Merchant Adventurers had moved after leaving Hamburg) was to be uprooted; and in the second place, all Hanseatic towns were to refuse English cloth, till England came to terms.

But these resolutions were powerless for good or evil without the assent and support of the territorial sovereigns of the various lands in which the Hanse towns were situated. To Dantzic was assigned the congenial task of winning over Stephen Bathory, and Cologne took upon itself the duty of gaining the ear of the emperor. It was the existence of a medieval commercial union that was jeopardised; but we must admit that the mercantile and industrial interests of northern Germany were also at stake.

It was on December 6, 1579, that Lübeck addressed the

[1] *Hanseatica*, 108.

[2] Ehrenberg, *Hamburg und England*, 151.

electors, and on January 2, 1580, that the joint protest of Lübeck, Hamburg, and Bremen was sent to the emperor and the electors, against the English monopolies.[1] The reply of the emperor was an order to the count of Ostfrisia, dated June 25, 1580, to expel from his state all English monopolists. And the following year, he wrote to Queen Elizabeth in favour of the Hanseatic merchants in England.

In the East, Dantzic had petitioned Stephen Bathory at the Polish Diet against the English, as early as December, 1579. In the document 'Informatio in causa Anglicana,' the demand was made that the king should not only refuse the English company permission to establish itself at Elbing, but also that the English should all be expelled from Poland, and commercial intercourse with them forbidden until they should restore to the Hanseatic merchants, as well as to the citizens of Poland, the liberties and privileges of which they had been deprived.[2] It seems that no reply was given to these demands, and certainly if the king of Poland needed an excuse for neglecting the petition of Dantzic, he could have found it in the necessary preparations he was making for his expedition against Muscovy. At any rate, in February, 1580, he was in Lithuania.

But Dantzic was not lightly to be put off. By every means it sought to gain the ear of the king; and with this in view sought allies within the ranks of the Polish court. And among the first whose help was enlisted was the Hungarian Berzevicius, chancellor of King Stephen as Duke of Transylvania. Berzevicius brought forward the memorial of Dantzic, which the king alleged had wholly passed from his memory, and denied that he had supported or encouraged the Elbingers in their bargain with the English merchants. He added that it was a matter of surprise that the Hanseatic towns, and the German people, did not spontaneously renounce all traffic with the greedy English,

[1] *Köln. Inv.*, ii. p. 191; Ehrenberg, 160.
[2] *Hanseatica*, 108.

for, as he believed, it would be easier for the Germans to do without English wares, than Englishmen to get along without German products. And if Berzevicius is to be trusted, the king was inclined to maintain the interests of the Dantzic traders, and indeed they needed only to point out to him what he could do, to enlist his active support.[1]

The importance which Dantzic attached to the assistance of Stephen Bathory is evident from the fact that not only was Daniel Herrmann dispatched as envoy, but George Lisemann himself was sent to lend weight to the Hanseatic position. Lisemann was able to prove to the king that the Hanse had the support of both the emperor and the king of Spain, along with that of the duke of Parma, the newly nominated governor of the Netherlands.[2]

The cause upheld by Dantzic had in its favour the additional weight of 200,000 florins which Dantzic pledged itself to pay to the king within five years. Besides this, the Polish monarch saw in the Hanse towns, as well as in the Hanse traders, the most likely source of loans to meet the necessities of his Muscovite campaign.

So on May 8, 1580, King Stephen, whilst at Wilna, drew up a mandate to the Elbingers directed against the position of the English company. This document was expressed in such general terms as to be of little importance, and meant little more than that the privileges of the Eastland Company were not to be enlarged or extended in scope.[3]

With such a measure, the ambassadors of Dantzic were naturally dissatisfied. They wanted the abolition of the whole English trade, and the closing of the English staple at Elbing.

It was in accordance with such feeling that Dantzic called a meeting of the Prussian towns. That masterful town also began to arrest English ships and wares in the

[1] *Hanseatica*, 108 (Letter of Berzevicius, March 27, 1580).
[2] *Hanseatica*, 108.
[3] *Ibid.*

spring of 1580, as a compensation for Hanseatic losses in England.[1] But as Elbing could not be induced to support this course, and indeed could not be brought to participate in the Diet, this policy of violence failed to be ratified, and was abandoned. Nor were Dantzic's efforts more successful at the court of Stephen Bathory. The Polish vice-chancellor, Jan Zamojski received most amiably all Hanseatic complaints, and seemed to promise much. So greatly were the envoys deceived that they asked that the mandate already drawn up should not be published, confident in the expectation of one more in accord with their policy of 'thorough.' But the wily Polish king dallied with the Dantzic agents, and finally postponed all action till the end of the war, having little desire to alienate England, or to further the domineering policy of Dantzic.

Lisemann was at last disappointed and disgusted. 'We run after everyone here like shoemakers,' he wrote. 'Scarcely anyone will listen to us. . . . Yet we do not demand money, arms or any extraordinary efforts, only a letter: if not an appeal to the English queen, then at least one to the Elbingers, that they might fulfil their duty: a letter commanding or refusing. The English queen is deaf to our requests and remonstrances. She gives faith and help to her subjects only. Are we Prussians and Hanseatics looked upon at this court in such a way?' He complained that he had made every effort, and had used his influence with the Hanse on behalf of Stephen Bathory, yet the latter gave only promises. How was he to justify the course of the negotiations before his colleagues? But as a last hope, he promised before leaving the Polish court, that in return for the desired support of Poland, he would move the whole Hanse to further the plans and espouse the cause of the king against Muscovy.[2]

[1] Gottfried Lengnich, *Die Geschichte der Lande Preussens königlich polnischen Antheils* (Dantzic, 1724), iii. 367; *Hanseatica*, 108 (April 15, 1580).

[2] *Hanseatica*, 108; *Köln. Inv.*, ii. p. 638.

In November, 1580, at Luneburg, a second Hanseatic congress was held. This congress, however, merely reiterated the old policy, and resolved upon the despatch of an embassy to Stephen Bathory: this time not in the name of Dantzic only, but on behalf of the whole Hanseatic League.[1] Not only did the Hanse request the withdrawal of the Eastland Company from Elbing, but claimed that the king of Poland should first consult it, before Elbing, or any other Prussian town, should conclude a commercial agreement with the English.

This petition of the Hanse was received by Stephen Bathory in Warsaw, but the reply was not reassuring. The king answered briefly, as if to end the whole matter, that he would write to the English queen, and appoint a commission to examine the complaints made and who should, in accordance with their decision, make answer to the Hanse conformable to the interests of the king and of the republic.[2] It required no great insight to penetrate the meaning of this reply. Stephen Bathory seemed lost to the cause of the league.

Although Elbing was a member of the Hanse, it found itself unable to bear the expense of participation in the Hanseatic Diets. Poor and weak as it was, Elbing was, nevertheless, able to withstand the threats of the League. When the Prussian towns themselves in 1581 communicated to it the resolutions of the Hanse to the effect that it should impose on English trade a $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. duty, and should produce the accounts of the same, Elbing answered with a refusal in the form of an excuse.[3] How sure this puny town was of the protection of powers beyond the influence of the Hanse is clearly seen in its treaty with the English ambassador, John Rogers, permitting the establishment of the Eastland Company in its midst.

In Warsaw, during March, 1581, Stephen Bathory

[1] *Hanseatica*, 108 (Nov. 20, 1580).
[2] *Hanseatica*, 131 (March 25, 1581); *Köln. Inv.*, ii. p. 216.
[3] *Hanseatica*, 108 (August, 1581).

received both the English envoys, John Rogers and William Salkins, and the Hanseatic advocate Lisemann.[1] Again the king referred the question at hand to the consideration of his commissioners. In this delay, the Elbingers found encouragement, and hastened to consent to the articles proposed by Rogers, and even offered to supply land and build a house for the company. This agreement of November 20, 1581,[2] concluded after two years of the English company's residence at Elbing, was the foundation of the existence of that company in Prussia for half a century. It is to be noted, however, that this pact, like that entered into at the company's first arrival, had not received the confirmation of the king of Poland.

Under this agreement, the organisation of the Eastland Company remained the same as fixed by charter. It was autonomous in both civil and criminal affairs, with reservations, however, of the rights of the Polish king and of the magistracy of Elbing. With the exception of arms and ammunition, the company could import and export without restraint. The company's goods imported were to be stored in special warehouses and shops. The freedom from new tolls remained as in 1579, and the question of those dues, over which Elbing had no control, was again left unsettled. The Elbingers reserved for themselves the privilege of loading and unloading big ships by means of their own barges.

The most valued privilege in the eyes of the English merchants was the freer trade allowed. They could deal directly with the merchants of Elbing and other Prussian towns, whilst in other Hanse towns they had to deal only with Hanseatic merchants. But the complete freedom of trade was denied them, in so far as they could not transfer goods from one ship to another; nor could they sell by retail, except in case of expensive cloth, which they were allowed to sell by the yard.

[1] *Köln. Inv.*, ii. p. 216.
[2] *Br. M.*, Nero, B. ii. ff. 155–186; *Köln. Inv.*, ii. p. 741.

Far as this was from what is now regarded as freedom of trade, it nevertheless was a big step towards the goal which the English merchants had in view, and was diametrically opposed to the principles of the Hanseatic League. This breach in the Hanseatic wall of privilege was one of the causes of the decline of the league, alongside of which must be placed local interest over-riding the general welfare of the union—as in Hamburg, Stade, Embden, and Elbing—and the jealousy which small and new towns felt towards the old and rich staples.

Besides the internal strife and discord making for evil within the League, there was the growing power of the territorial lords and the increasing desire of those lords to draw a sharp line between aliens and denizens. Though the leaders of the Hanse did not understand the principle of the new development, they at least fully appreciated the fact, and throughout their negotiations appealed for help to the emperor and the king of Poland against the queen of England.

At the Imperial Diet of Augsburg, in October, 1582, the defensive measures of the Congress of Lübeck, held two years before, were admitted and accepted. In other words, Germany was backing the Hanseatic League in its struggle with England, and the commercial policy of the Hanse was taken over as the foreign policy of the empire.

To this Diet of Augsburg, Elizabeth sent her ambassador, Dr. George Gilpin, to uphold the English commercial methods and to exculpate English merchants from the charge of monopoly. Two lines of action seemed open to the Diet. A petition to Queen Elizabeth, in the name of the German Empire, was considered but abandoned, because not in keeping with the dignity of the empire, and partly because there was little likelihood of success. The alternative was a conference with the English ambassador soon due to arrive in Germany; but in the meantime arguments were to be emphasised by action. And it was

unanimously agreed that all trade by land or sea should be closed to the Merchant Adventurers, and their staple abolished.[1] This resolution was approved and confirmed by the emperor, who was probably influenced in his decision by the Spanish king and the duke of Parma. The execution of this decree the emperor postponed, and in the meantime he merely sent letters to Queen Elizabeth and to the Count of Ostfrisia: in the latter case threatening severe reprisals if the English were not expelled from Ostfrisia.[2]

But neither England nor Ostfrisia paid much attention to these epistles. And it was all in vain that Sudermann urged the execution of the resolution of the Diet. To his arguments, the vice-chancellor, Vieheuser—not unlikely stimulated by the gold of English merchants—replied that the Hanse towns were too headstrong, and that their general attitude towards the emperor ill became them; and further, that a vote of the Hanse was not yet an imperial decree.

In England, the course of negotiations seemed as void of success. The slight influence of the emperor and the imperial assembly among adjacent nations was brought home very forcibly to the minds of the Hanseatic envoys in London in the year 1585. On behalf of the Privy Council, Robert Beale, addressing the Hanseatic deputation, spoke in raillery of the unity and harmony of the imperial orders, and the methods and plans of the emperor. To this imputation of disunion, the behaviour of the Hamburg delegates seemed, indeed, to give assent.[3]

Such were the vicissitudes of Hanseatic fortunes in the West. In the East, Stephen Bathory showed an inclination towards agreement when Queen Elizabeth asked for the favourable treatment of the Eastland Company in Elbing. So Elizabeth, in July, 1583, sent John Herbert

[1] *Hanseatica*, 108.
[2] Record Office: *State Papers, Foreign*, Germany, Empire, i. 44.
[3] Ehrenberg, 175.

and William Salkins, as her ambassadors, to Poland to negotiate on behalf of the company at Elbing.[1]

In all of the Polish negotiations at this time, Dantzic stood out as the untiring enemy of Elbing, and of the English company within its rival's walls. In the Prussian Diet, it raised a complaint against the infraction of those laws which prohibited strangers from having more commercial freedom than the local merchants. Of course, Elbing could not help feeling that this was aimed at it. Dantzic and Elbing also stood in opposite camps on the subject of the employment of strangers in certain industries in towns and villages.[2]

In the financial negotiations carried on between Dantzic and the king of Poland, the former seized another opportunity of making a thrust at Elbing. Dantzic was willing to consent to an increase in the customs, but stipulated that Elbing too should submit to the impost. In such a proposition, Dantzic felt that the support of the king was to be counted on, seeing that his own fiscal interests were concerned.[3]

The attitude of England towards these schemes could only be hostile. Still, through all the sinuosities of negotiations, the English envoys steadfastly kept two main points in mind: the conclusion of a final treaty between the Eastland Company and Elbing, and the confirmation of the same by the king of Poland.

The emphasis placed upon such a public confirmation, by the English government, is easily understood. On the one hand, the effect within Poland would be to silence the complaints of Dantzic, or at least to check the undermining plots of that town against the company at Elbing. On the other hand, a precedent would be created which Elizabeth could use in her negotiations with other foreign powers on behalf of English merchants.

[1] *Br. M.*, Galba, D. xiii. f. 41; *Hanseatica*, 108.
[2] Lengnich, iii. 436.
[3] Record Office: *State Papers, Foreign*, Poland, i. 23 (March 31, 1583).

In the second half of 1583, the English envoys came to terms with Elbing in the form of articles, which in large part were only an amplification of those of 1581. According to this agreement, the English company was to have jurisdiction over its own affairs, together with the freedom of trade and of worship. Elbing, on its part, was to enjoy the right of sailing in English waters, and trading with English ports. But these were privileges which were not denied to any members of the Hanseatic League, and were indeed quite illusory, since Elbing had few, if any, ships to send to England. Other minor matters, such as the reciprocal surrender of commercial delinquents, and the mutual consideration of difficulties, were included in the terms.[1] But Elbing could point to no single advantage of moment to itself, except the fact of the company's secured and continued residence within its bounds; and, indeed, its magistrates probably considered the presence of the English staple all that was sufficient for Elbing's immediate needs.

The effect of this further move on the part of Elbing was to stimulate its rival, Dantzic, to greater efforts. Both towns sought friends within the Polish republic, and advocates at the Polish court, and found them: Dantzic in the person of the chancellor, Jan Zamojski, and Elbing in the person of the primate, Stanislaw Karnkowski.[2] It would be of interest, incidentally, to know whether there had, up to this time, arisen the antagonism which so long existed between these two most eminent personalities.

The test of these semi-personal, semi-political alliances was soon to be made; for in the beginning of the year 1584, the English envoys, as well as the magistrates of Elbing, hastened to Lithuania to induce Stephen Bathory to ratify the agreement lately made between the English and the

[1] Articuli, quibus conventum est inter Reginae Angliae et reg. civitatis Elbingensis commissarios. *Br. M.*, Galba, D. xiii. ff. 42–45. *Cf.* Lengnich, iii. 72.

[2] For the importance attributed by Karnkowski to these negotiations, see A. Szelagowski, *The Struggle for the Baltic* (Polish), 92 (Cracow, 1904).

Elbingers. But the king temporised and appointed a commission, consisting of several senators, to make further inquiry into the merits and demerits of the rival causes.[1]

On July 27, 1584, this commission met at Elbing, and heard the arguments of both sides. The Elbingers emphasised the fact that they had received the king's permission; whilst the representatives of Dantzic pointed out the wreck and ruin which must befall the Prussian towns if such privileges as the English had were given to foreign merchants; and that once the English gained a foothold in Prussia, they would not only absorb in time the whole Prussian trade with the Netherlands, France, Denmark, Sweden, and Spain, but even transform Prussians into Englishmen.[2] The outcome of the hearing before this commission was that the question was again left undecided, and referred to the Polish king at the congress which was to assemble at Lublin in August 1584.

At this congress, the English ambassador, Herbert, was received by Stephen Bathory, and overwhelmed by the civilities of senators and other dignatories. Not only did he receive numerous promises, but he was assured that the English position was enthusiastically supported within the senate itself. When Herbert requested the assistance and advocacy of the great royal secretary, Baranowski, the latter assured the English ambassador that such was unnecessary, since sufficient recommendations had already been made to the king.[3] But once again the final decision was postponed: this time, probably, because Stephen Bathory was too absorbed by other and more important business—the plot of the great family of Zborowski. A second commission was named, which met first at Lublin, and after the departure of the king, at Lubartow at the

[1] Members of the commission: Piotr Kostka, bishop of Chelmno, Piotr of Potulic, wojewoda of Brzesc, Jan Dulski, royal vice-treasurer, Stefan Grudzinski, castellain of Naklo, and Stanislaw Kostka, chamberlain of Chelmno.

[2] *Hanseatica*, 108; Lengnich, iii. No. 73.

[3] *Br. M.*, Galba, D. XIII. ff. 6–12 (Nov. 6, 1584).

seat of the Firleys. The commissioners,[1] regarded by the Elbingers as favourable to their cause, were among the most highly civilised people of Poland at this time. Indeed the castellan of Rawa was regarded as a second Cicero. The English envoy was favourably impressed: 'All four of noble birth, are most highly esteemed, and are recommended for the affairs of the kingdom by reason of their wisdom and experience.'

The memorial[2] drawn up by this commission is a most noteworthy document, not only because it is the expression of opinion of such distinguished Poles on commercial policy, but because it may be regarded as the official view of growing Polish nationalism.

The commissioners considered on the one hand the interests of Dantzic, and on the other the interests of the republic. Dantzic had often rebelled against the king, and many were the complaints in the Diets against the exclusive position of that town in commercial matters, the gentry not being allowed even to buy or sell anything on their own account without giving notice to the Prussian merchants. To the minds of the commissioners, the position of Dantzic seemed that of a monopolist, to whom the Eastland Company at Elbing might prove a beneficial competitor. The arguments of Dantzic against the residence of the Eastland Company at Elbing could be based neither upon special privileges nor the laws of the country. The alleged injury to the republic was not evident. Furthermore, since, according to the declaration of the English company at Elbing that they would in no case establish themselves in Dantzic, it was difficult to see any valid grounds for Dantzic's position of hostility.

The commission concluded that the agreement of 1583, between the Eastland Company and Elbing, was on the whole worthy of recommendation. The question, however,

[1] Tarlo, wojewoda of Lublin, the three Firleys, the castellain of Lublin, Rawa, and Biecz.

[2] *Hanseatica*, 108. *Br. M.*, Galba, D. XIII. ff. 73–75.

of allowing foreign merchants to trade with one another rather than only with local merchants was not decided, but reserved for the judgment of the king. And since Herbert could not consent to the restoration of the Hanseatic privileges in England, no decision was reached on that most vital point.

One condition was made, with reference to the vexatious duties, that the rate at Elbing should be the same as at Dantzic—that is, two oboles (fenigs) to the mark. In this the commissioners showed not only consideration for the royal treasury, but also a desire to maintain a just balance between the two rival towns. The Elbingers, however, insisted that, if they were to have no advantage over Dantzic in the matter of tolls, the neighbouring ports of Braunsberg, Frauenburg, and, in fact, the whole gulf of Svieza (Frischhafen), should have no advantage over them, but be obliged to collect their tolls at the same rate.

The English were unable to comply with the request of the commissioners for a just price to be set upon English cloth—that is, they would not consent to a moderation of prices, saying that the matter was too complex; for the cost of the cloth in England, the expense of transportation, and the tolls in the Sound, would have to be considered. Besides, they raised the counterclaim that Polish prices should be lowered—a demand which had recently been made several times.

The form which the agreement was to take was a matter of some uncertainty. Was it to be a Polish royal charter for the Eastland Company, or a commercial treaty between Stephen Bathory and Elizabeth? And was the settlement to be permanent or for a period? The recommendation of the royal commission was that a treaty was most practical; and, taking into consideration the possibility of changes and developments, that the treaty be for a specified period.

It cannot be said that, on the whole, the findings of the commission were going to lead to a new situation. The Eastland Company was to retain its establishment at Elbing, together with its partial freedom of trade and

rights of staple. Most important of all, the attitude of the commissioners towards Elbing put a curb on the pretensions of the great republic of traders—Dantzic.

On March 16, 1585, took place a scene in the royal chamber, which proved the epilogue to the quarrel between Dantzic and Elbing. The syndic of Dantzic, Henry Lembke, wished the Polish queen a happy voyage and recommended the town to the royal favour. The king replied: 'Gentlemen, return home, and farewell.' Returning from the apartments of the queen, the king was later met by the mayor of Elbing, who, falling on his knees, implored him to sign the articles concluded between Elbing and the Eastland Company two years before. The royal answer was: 'I can by no means satisfy your demand. The rest shall be told you by the chancellor.' The chancellor had little more to say: the pretensions of the English were contrary to the laws and statutes of the kingdom, and, as the latter forbade monopolies, it was of course not to be expected that this one at Elbing could be confirmed.

It is to be remarked that this refusal to ratify officially and before the world the agreement entered into in 1583, between Elbing and the English, meant in practice comparatively little. In theory, the Eastland Company was to be allowed to trade not only in Elbing, but also in Dantzic, Riga, or elsewhere, in the same way as formerly. In reality the Polish crown chose to be neutral. Elbing seems to have fully appreciated the situation, and on May 3, 1585, concluded a treaty embodying the agreement entered into two years previously, and postponed its confirmation by the king to a more favourable time.[1] That Elbing enjoyed the tacit consent of the crown is proven by the fact that it collected the pale-toll[2] at the same rate and in the same manner as agreed upon between Dantzic and Stephen Bathory during this same year,[3] and received it for the profit of the royal treasury.

[1] Lengnich, iii. 458. [2] Pfahlzoll.
[3] Cf. *Scriptores rerum polonicarum*, xviii. 249, 253.

The fruits of what was practically a settlement of the whole matter were soon to be evident. The formerly insignificant harbour of Elbing now grew rapidly. The English trade, particularly in cloth, soon reached unprecedented dimensions, and English merchants trading in Poland were to be numbered in thousands. It is indeed not without cause that Sigismund III called the English company in Elbing, 'the master and arbiter of the Polish (Baltic) trade,' in the early years of the seventeenth century.[1]

Dantzic entirely ceased its opposition before the close of the century, and the Eastland Company remained at Elbing. The Merchant Adventurers, bearing a more strenuous part of the general contest though not enjoying such unbroken continuity of establishment at Hamburg, did nevertheless win their point too. Elbing and Hamburg then remained the outposts and strongholds of the struggle for a footing in foreign markets. The Hanse was treading the path of rapid and final decline. And the victory of nationality in trade, in which the Eastland Company had played its part, was decisive, if not complete.

[1] Dantzic Archives: *Handel Convolut*, 19a (Dec. 15, 1604).

THE RECORDS OF THE ENGLISH AFRICAN COMPANIES

By HILARY JENKINSON, B.A., F.S.A., F.R.Hist.S.

Read January 18, 1912.

NOTE.—At the time that this Paper was planned and begun the Records with which it proposed to deal were practically unknown: nor did there seem to be a prospect of their becoming the subject of any work of importance in the near future. By the time, however, that the Paper, postponed for various reasons, was near to the time of reading, the subject of the Chartered Companies had already been attacked in Mr. Scott's important work; and it was evident that both this question and the more particular ones relating to the African Companies would not long remain undeveloped. Under these circumstances the writer thought it best to produce his Paper, though with modifications; attempting no more than a statement of the point of view from which, as it seemed to him, these (and other) Records might well be approached.

I.—Introductory

What I propose to put before the Society is a study in English diplomatic, that is, in the Science of Diplomatic under the form which I conceive it may take when applied to English Records. Opinion is so vague upon many points connected with this Science—such for instance as whether it is an unchanging series of rules, or merely a method of looking at historical sources which varies with the subject to which it is applied; whether it is applicable to documents of all periods and countries; whether it is an essential preliminary or only an interesting supplement to historical research upon documents—Diplomatic is, in fact, still so unreal a thing to many of the mass of students who now use documents for their work that it may be a little profitable to give, not indeed an exposition of its principles,

but a slight view of its practical working upon an easily comprehended group of documents. If it can be made to appear that an ordered survey thus taken is a useful, even essential, preliminary to practical search in documents after any class of information, the fact that the documents here used are much later in date than those which usually form the subject of this science, will only make stronger the plea for its serious consideration by historical students. Though the mistakes caused by neglect of any introductory study of the inner side of the documents used may be more glaring (as indeed they are very glaring) in the case of the medieval than in that of the modern classes; though the latter are more comprehensible as being less removed, by reason of their dates, from our habits of thought and action; yet I hope it may appear that the difference in the character of English Records of all manner of dates is much less than it is usually believed.

Records.

Among all documents it is of Records that I wish particularly to speak. The first great point in Record study is the truth (apparently a simple one, but quite remarkably neglected) that they were not drawn up for the information of posterity; being in fact the Diary [1] of the Department or other administrative body which produced them. It follows from this alone that Record study should be a dual study, approaching its subject from within and from without. Both the arrangement [2] of Records (which is not here my concern) and their comprehension (which is) should depend entirely on an understanding of their relations in the past with the past; on an understanding,

[1] The essence of a true diary being that it is drawn up for the information of the Diarist only, and, consequently, uninfluenced by the point of view or habits of any but himself: while, on the other hand, a knowledge of his habits and point of view is essential for its comprehension by an outsider. *Cf.* particularly Pepys.

[2] Pirenne in his preface to the French edition of Flith and Fruin's *Manuel pour le classement . . . des Archives* gives as the basis for correct arrangement of Muniments '*le respect pour les fonds.*' *Fonds* may be roughly paraphrased 'collections as they have come down to us from their collectors.'

in other words, of the circumstances and the offices which produced them. This understanding achieved, they may be approached, externally, for the information which they were not intended to give but which they do indirectly furnish to modern research.

Natural arrangement and artificial classification.

The natural and proper arrangement of Records follows, then, the circumstances of their production. The Court of Chancery has left us voluminous rolls of letters under the great seal, notes of its pleadings, files of original and judicial writs, writs with returns, documents 'exhibited' in suits and so forth: the interest of these merely as Rolls, Proceedings, Writs is incomplete; its complement is the fact that all are members of the body of one Court, the Chancery, and were kept for reference by that Court in a particular way. That is the basis of Record arrangement. For the purposes of modern research, however, they may be, in imagination, divided into certain classes as,

1. Records proper—*i.e.* things drawn up in writing to commemorate official acts of which they themselves form a part and subsequently preserved in official custody for official reference.[1] These, again, may be divided into (*a*) those which are copies of writings sent out or received—the Chancery Enrolments in my illustration; (*b*) those which are notes of proceedings such as the Chancery *Placita*; (*c*) originals, letters, accounts and so forth filed and preserved to serve the same end as the two previous divisions, for instance the writs and returns mentioned above or the Bills and Answers in 'Chancery Proceedings.'

2. Documents which are not strictly Public Records—private or other muniments which find themselves in their present position as a result of some violent or unnatural transfer in the past. One instance, again already quoted, is furnished by the Chancery Exhibits, private documents

[1] This is a rough definition. In its strictest sense the word 'Record' means only judicial proceedings. *Cf.* Hall, *Studies in English Official Historical Documents*, pp. 53 *seq.*

which were put in as evidence by parties to a suit and never withdrawn by their owners.

This classification [1] is the second great point I should wish to make in a general consideration of English Records. There is a third—that of their continuity and inter-communication. Every class, hanging on, as it were, to another, shows clearly the links which connect it to one common origin (the personal Court of the King) and to other series sprung from the same: and such intercommunication exists even between the two main classes referred to above—Records proper and the others. I know of no single class of English Records which can be properly worked without reference—considerable and careful reference—to its predecessors and its contemporaries, and in many cases to its successors.

Record working.

Leading on now to the external side, as I have called it, of Record work and also intermixed with it we have to notice in passing three great sources of information besides this one of Records; namely, contemporary accounts, subsequent accounts and criticisms, and other contemporary or parallel evidences. And so we come to the points of interest to be noted by the external worker: in the nature of things these cannot be general; they belong in every case to the particular subject in hand—in the present instance to the English trade with West Africa.

It is the task of the present Paper to show the African Companies' Records conforming with the divisions, classification and peculiarities enumerated above; and, passing to the external side, to take some cognisance (slight, of course) of the other sources of information and (slighter still, for the mass is so great) of the detailed information supplied by the documents themselves.

[1] It is necessary to emphasise the imaginary, or 'paper,' nature of this. Documents may be, in this sense, classified over and over again according to individual opinions or needs: a material sorting or arrangement is generally irrevocable; and, as such, is condemned by many authorities.

II.—The African Companies

Surface comparisons.

Now in considering the Records of the African Companies we naturally look first for any parallel collection among English official archives. There is only one —the collection of the East India Companies.[1] In however detached a manner we approach our subject we cannot free our minds from certain general impressions applying equally to both these collections and, particularly, to the circumstances which produced them. The Records of the East India Companies are now fairly well known, those of the African are not; but no one, to my knowledge, has dealt with certain small peculiarities of the Records, as Records, of the group (standing, as I said, alone in English archives) which is formed by these two together. For these reasons it may be well to suggest at once certain obvious lines of similarity and dissimilarity between the two Companies. What we have seen in the East India Company forms a clue to what we may expect in the African.

In point of date the Indies have an advantage, so far as concerns actual incorporation. But the same period of English history produced both Companies and both touch it, as well upon its foreign as upon its domestic side, at the same points. The student of monopolies will see in the case of both the same symptoms; and anyone who has worked at the causes of our successive wars in the 16th and 17th centuries will expect to see the two assume the same position—that of irritant points—in the history of our foreign relations. The last remark may be extended to

[1] The East India Company's *Records* are kept at the India Office, which has published various lists; for instance that of the '*Factory*' *Records*. Some records of other Companies (e.g. the Virginia) are scattered through the State Papers Domestic: and in the State Papers Foreign are some of the Levant Company. But there is no considerable body of such Records except those mentioned in the text. The Muscovy (now the Russia) Company's Minute Books exist, I understand, from a very early date (1666): but these are still in the hands of the Company.

apply to the 18th century; and turning again to the domestic side I need hardly point out that the same period saw in the changing of the colonies and settlements from private into national possessions no more than a continuation and conclusion of that same monopoly question, while at the present day we have—two parallel results—on the one hand the Indian Empire, on the other British West Africa. Both Companies, too, emerged from an initial state of doubtful experiment in joint-stock business into that of flourishing concerns and both had their periods of falling.

A second point of similarity is that in both cases we come in contact from the first with contemporary printed sources. For an introduction to either subject we must draw largely on the same books—Hakluyt, Purchas and the like—and both give rise, then and later, to similar printed manifestoes, broadsides and treatises.

Both again—a third point—take the same place among English Records: they are there owing to what has been called above violent transfer; not originally or in their nature Government archives, they have become so because Government took them when it took the position of their compilers and natural owners.

Another point:—a like act of the Crown created both the African and Indian Companies; both we may expect to be cast in the same mould and invested with the same privileges. The internal administration of the two will probably, in the circumstances, be alike, the details of their internal history will run upon similar lines.

And once more:—both, for their purposes, expatriated Englishmen to little known parts of the world, there to make the fortunes of their employers and, if they could, of themselves; there also to take the position of masters of great numbers of alien inferiors.

It is here that we come to the great dissimilarity between the two. The servants of the India Company went to a land already highly civilised, an enormous country very rich in natural products. The African coast and the African

peoples are the obvious inferiors of India and the Indians in all these respects; and the African trader, who could not supplement his exports of natural products with manufactures, supplemented them with a supply of unskilled labour. While slavery lasted, therefore, the African might sustain a comparison with the Indian trade; slavery gone, it collapsed into the comparatively unimportant position proper to its inferior extent and resources.

Here we must leave the East India Company: space does not permit of a comparison of the two, Record for Record. We may note, however, that this preliminary examination of surface facts—for the examination of the unknown African in the light of the known Indian lies on the surface—this comparison has indicated already a number of lines of inquiry and has shown to some extent how the present subject may illustrate the chief theoretical points of Record work. To recapitulate :—

Lines of inquiry in the present Paper.

From this preliminary of preliminaries we have gathered that we shall have to go first to Hakluyt and other printed sources; and here we observe that with printing comes not only a great increase in one of the sources supplementary to Records, but also a corresponding modification in the position of Records themselves: we shall have to go also—and this illustrates the intercommunication between all classes of Records—firstly to those archive sources which contain the instruments, the commissions, which gave our companies birth, and secondly to those of foreign and domestic history.

Our preliminary investigation has also found for us the reason why these private muniments figure in the public collections at all; and has assigned them to the class of documents which are not Public Records in the strictest sense of the term or which have only become so. It has further suggested that among the beginnings of new policies and activities here displayed we may expect new forms of the Records themselves—the commercial forms, for instance.

Finally, we have gathered that in these Records we shall find means to supply new or supplement existing accounts of the history of the Companies: in which connection we have to consider firstly their position as Companies at various periods, the persons who composed them, their governance, their internal dissensions, their enemies and rivals; secondly their relation to State affairs, foreign and domestic; thirdly the commerce they carried on and its relations with the natives; and fourthly, the lives of their servants in Africa.

Preliminary study of the Companies.

The classes of information to be used at this point have already been alluded to, and the particulars will appear sufficiently from the footnotes. I need make special reference only to the work of the numerous writers upon the East India Company, the Hudson Bay Company, the American Colonies and so forth, all contributing some information or illustration; to Mr. Scott's[1] learned volume upon joint stock companies; to a forthcoming volume of the Selden Society;[2] and to one or two detached papers out of the actual Records we are considering, which themselves serve as an introduction.

According to an anonymous MS.[3] the Portuguese first reached West Africa in 1442. We need not consider very seriously the tale of a *Dieppois* visit to Elmira in 1380.[4] In any case there is no doubt that the Portuguese penetrated to Sierra Leone in 1448, and to Senegal and Gambia in 1455,[5] and before this last date, in 1450, negroes are said to have been taken into Portugal by a Company formed to trade with Guinea in gold, ivory and slaves.[6] Hakluyt's first mention of them is for the year 1481, when he tells us

[1] W. R. Scott, *Joint Stock Companies to* 1720, vol. ii.

[2] I am indebted to the courtesy of the editor, Mr. C. T. Carr, for much illustrative matter relating to early chartered companies.

[3] African Companies Records, 1584.

[4] Sir H. Johnston mentions this story in his *Colonisation of Africa.*

[5] *Cf.* Sir H. Johnston, *op. cit.*

[6] *Ibid.*

of a Portuguese embassy to England which asserted their sovereign right in Guinea—so early do we find ourselves touching the history of English foreign relations. In the same year, according to my anonymous writer, they built their first fort on the coast. My informant (who wrote in the eighteenth century) says that the Spanish began their trade in 1502, and notes that in 1517 Charles V allowed the Portuguese to furnish slaves. In the year 1553 begin the English voyages chronicled by Hakluyt, the first being to Guinea and Benin ; it was followed by three more in the next three years. The last two of these were by the famous merchant William Towerson, who made yet another in 1577, on which occasion one of his ships was a Queen's ship. The Royal interest, indeed, in such enterprises dates from the earliest—an indenture still exists,[1] probably of the year 1560, to testify that Elizabeth rigged, victualled and lent two ships for the African trade in return for one-third of the profits. It is interesting also to note that in 1564 a meeting of the adventurers for discussion is chronicled. We need not dwell on the voyages of 1562, 1564, 1565 and 1566 save to note three points. We find repeated mention of the same names—men began to specialise in the trade ; in 1562 John Hawkins first, so far as is known, connected this country with the slave trade, selling negroes in Hispaniola ; and in 1565 we have mention of a fight with Portuguese galleys.

About 1582 we find the Portuguese violently and successfully resisting their English rivals, now apparently joined by the French, in Guinea ; and in 1588 the English turned their attention to Benin, Sierra Leone, Gambia and Senegal.[2] At this point Royal protection took one step further and we pass in our search for origins into contemporary records ; a company being founded under the protection of Royal letters patent in that year.[3] We

[1] *S.P. Dom. Elizabeth* 26, Nos. 43 and 44.
[2] *Cf.* Ellis's *History of the Gold Coast*, under this date.
[3] *Patent Roll*, 1312.

need only notice in passing two points in this: one that there is no incorporation clause in this Charter, though the partners are authorised to meet together for discussion: the second that there is no mention of negroes.

Here we may observe that this Charter was only one of many. The India trade had already been fostered in the same way; so had the Merchant Adventurers of London on more than one occasion; so had the Russian Company in 1565; while the Italian Company is said to have received similar encouragement in the previous century. In England itself mining Companies present themselves from 1526 onwards, and one had been actually incorporated in 1568.[1] The period immediately following was even more productive of patents—the East India Company being incorporated in 1600, the Virginia Company in 1606, the Nova Scotia in 1610, and so forth; there were something like sixty settlements in America between 1600 and 1660.[2]

To return to our Africans. In 1618 came what is called the Governor and Company of Adventurers of London trading into the parts of Africa.[3] This patent makes provision for the choice of a Governor and for periodical meetings of members, giving power to the associates to summon courts, make rules and so forth. The Company, which made another step forward by beginning the building of forts on the coast, was unsuccessful and found itself presently with a number of unsatisfied creditors, the meeting of whose demands had to be provided for by the next Royal Grant, made in 1631[4]: which grant practically re-established the former Company, or the survivors of it, in the dominion previously granted to them over the 'continent of Guinea,' and gave them an even stricter monopoly; their activities being limited only by Cape Blanco on the north and the

[1] See Scott, *op. cit.*, for notes upon the earliest Companies.

[2] *See* the Record Office *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial*, 1574–1660, *Introduction*, p. viii.

[3] *Patent Roll*, 2170.

[4] *Patent Roll*, 2573.

Cape of Good Hope in the south. This Company was again unsuccessful. The Civil War was not in its favour : we find that Prince Rupert, formerly (again the Royal interest appears) a Governor, now interfered with its trade ; and, to quote again the anonymous writer, ' the troubles opened the trade,' though a resolution of the Council recommended the continuation of the monopoly in 1651. Foreigners, the Swedes and the Dutch, also did harm : the Dutch were particularly active at the time and were gradually ousting the Portuguese from Africa, just as, in 1600, the English had found them ousting the Spanish and Portuguese in India. With the Restoration came an immediate revival of the personal interest of the Crown in this trade, and two patents, one in 1660 of incorporation and one, confirming this, in 1662.[1]

III.—The Records of the Companies

So we come to the Record-making period. Now Administrative Offices, and the series of Records which mirror them, may be started or modified by two forces ; the first being that of the summary act of authority—a statute, decree or patent—the second that of natural growth. The beginning of our Records we have practically assigned to the first of these forces when we spoke of the patents of incorporation ; though these make no mention of Records, yet Records follow almost inevitably : of more gradual modifications later we shall, again, see something presently.

It will be noticed that I speak now of the Archives of the Companies as of *Records*. The fact is that they stand in relation to the body that created them in the same relation in which the Chancery or any other series of Public Records stand to the Court to which it belongs. It may, indeed, be generally laid down concerning the second great class of Records—the *violent transfer* class, if I may use that name

[1] *Patent Rolls*, 2936 and 3029.

once more—that if they be of sufficient importance and extent they will fall, within their own bounds, into much the same classification as the first class; the corporate body, even the private person, being placed in a position, as it were, of local government, will produce what are to all intents and purposes Records: and in these, if the 'government' has a reasonably extended scope, we may look for a reproduction of our classes of enrolments or copies of documents issued, and sometimes of documents received; of notes of proceedings and of filed originals. *The form of Private Records tends always to copy that of their analogies among the Public ones.*[1]

The Old Classes.

We may expect, then, our Records to reflect the delegation by the Crown to the Company of very full powers of government, and we may expect representatives of the three classes I have alluded to. But we have now to add something to all this in view of the particular nature of the producing body. We may add:—

The New Modifications.

(1) That a large number of *Accounts* are to be expected from this large body of individuals trading as one—we are to have, as I said, the commercial record.

(2) That we are now in the *State Paper* period.

The State paper class, or class consisting of correspondence with enclosures, did not exactly succeed—for it did not displace—the medieval writ and return methods; under the earlier plan authority, requiring information, issued a writ ordering the receiver either to come and give it orally or to make a return, which he did on the back of the writ, or with the writ attached to it, or (as constantly appears, *e.g.* in Episcopal Registers) quoting the writ in full. The increase in official business and at the same time in facilities for written correspondence grafted on to the old plan, and the

[1] This rule holds good from the earliest times. Perhaps the best and earliest example is that of the *Winchester Pipe Roll* (of which a facsimile has been published by the School of Economics) with its close imitation of the forms of its Exchequer prototype.

old class of Records, this new class of State Papers, dignified from an early date with a separate office and place of deposit, with their files of original letters and with Entry Books to take the place of returned writs.[1] It is this new department of Record activity that a large section of our documents closely parallels and imitates.

(3) That along with the increase in supplementary sources due to it, *printing* is also responsible for a new class of Record. There may now be in existence a large number of copies of some printed and published work one only of which, being preserved in a collection of archives, takes the position of a Record. In a more important place than the African Archives, printed proclamations which begin with Henry VIII offer an obvious example of this. Of course, printed matter so placed acquires a special significance *ipso facto*.[2]

History of the Records.

The Records of the African Companies came into the Public Record Office in 1847 : the statute which dissolved the last Company in 1820 had vested all its property (including, of course, its muniments) in the Crown, and they were transferred from the old Treasury buildings. That they had there been in some confusion may be judged from the report[3] of the remover, and from the fact that a volume of the Minutes of a political club, seized at the time of the trials of Horne Tooke and others, with other books having no connection, came with them. 'The greater part of the history of West Africa,' says their remover, 'might no doubt be learned from them prior to the information which modern travellers and benevolent societies have given to the world.'

[1] The State Paper Office, whose history has been the subject of several works, maintained a separate existence from about 1578 to 1852.

[2] Some of the best examples of these are the series of printed lists, often with official annotations, among the *Admiralty* and *War Office Records*. Of course the absence of annotation in the official copy is equally important as evidence.

[3] See D.K.'s *Report VII.*, ii. 21. They were removed to the Treasury, July 9, 1824.

The first Company.

The first of the three companies in which (as Record producers) we are now interested was incorporated by Letters Patent in 1662 : the incorporation clause implies, with other advantages, power to take, purchase, etc., to plead and be impleaded and to have a common seal ; also to appoint agents and factors, with provision for their oaths of service ; and power to assemble, make and execute laws, and so forth. After this, given the energy to take advantage of it, we may expect the fullest records of the grantees' corporate action. And it may be said at once that neither this nor the two Companies that followed it in the direction of the West African trade failed in that respect. In this matter they compare favourably, whether by an original superior carefulness or subsequent better fortune in the preservation of their muniments, with other Companies. In the case of the majority of these Records remembrance of them has almost entirely disappeared ; and others are decidedly inferior. The scattered remains of the Virginia Company, for instance, cannot come near ours in regularity and completeness, nor can those of any Colonial Company.[1] The East India Company is certainly not their superior. The Hudson Bay Company, incorporated in 1670 and existing to the present day, has no doubt conserved its Archives, and the same may be said of the Muscovy Company ; but of them I cannot speak. At least so far as public and accessible Records are concerned the African Companies furnish the best examples that can be studied in their particular kinds.

The Records then of the first of our Companies are confined to the class I have called Proceedings, and consist of seven books. The first of these is a minute book[2] of which, as covering nearly the whole life of this Company, I should like to say a little more than of the others.

[1] See above, p. 189, note.

[2] *Afr. Co.'s Rec.*, 75. This volume has been extensively used by Mr Scott.

The first page, dated 'the 8th of March 1663' (1664), at once offers matter of interest. Those present include apparently the Governor and sub-governor, whose names are not given; but the long list of names immediately following is, alone, worth investigation. Following this list are resolutions as to sending all cargoes in 'shippes of force' and the appointment of a Committee to bring to his Majesty's attention the 'uniust claimes' of the Dutch 'and the affrontes therein offered to his Majestie's subjects.' This again is followed by details of a contract and transference of shares.

At a second meeting, three days later, we find Prince Rupert[1] present, as he frequently was afterwards; and by the July following, at any rate, his Royal Highness the Governor (the Duke of York) had begun a habit of personal attendance which he seems to have kept up with considerable regularity: the attendance of other members of the 'Court of Assistants' seems also to have been good, but their names are not always entered.

The Book is, in fact, a rough one: it contains, besides minutes in the usual form, occasional (only occasional) copies of letters, jotted memoranda and (frequently) signatures for the transference of Stock; the first two of the latter to appear are 'James' and 'Charles R' under date 'the 10th May 1664': James then invested £2000, the King £500.

In spite of its roughness the Book gives us a regular account of frequent meetings and the details of much business, including, of course (e.g. on p. 38) the carrying of 'blackes' to the Plantations, until those troubles came upon the Company which led to its dissolution, or rather reformation, in 1672. On the last page but one we find that:—

> At a Generall Court of the Company of Royall Adventurers of England trading into Affrica, Holden at Whitehall in the Roabes Chamber the 18th of October 1672.

[1] See above, p. 195.

PRESENT

His Royall Highnesse Governo^{r}
John Buckworth Esq^{r} Depu^{ty} Governo^{r}
Earl of Anglesey
Earl of Craven
Lord Hawley
Mr. Grey
S^{r} John Shaw
S^{r} Robert Viner
Alderman Bence &^{ca}

Mr. Buckworth acquainted his Roy^{ll} H^{nes} and this Court, that the old Charter, as to the trade therein limitted, was surrendered to his Ma^{ty} and thereupon his Ma^{ty} had bin gratiously pleased, to grant a new one, by the name of the Royall Affrican Comp^{a} of England. . . .

The new order of things is signalised by a new and careful script which is carried on into the series of Minute Books belonging to the new Company.

Preceding this meeting is a blank extending from November 1671. Perhaps the troubles and quarrels which filled that period may be inferred from the last entry, which details the arrangements made for a meeting, at the African House in Throgmorton Street, between Representatives of the Company on the one hand and of certain 'Owners, Fraighters and Commanders' of ships on the other, there to discuss the differences between them; also from the 'Propositions for Reviving the trade of Africa' which were read on September 11 in the same year. The first article of these relates to 'his Majesty's arreares' and the second to those of other members; the third to debts in Barbadoes, already the subject of an Order in Council; the fourth to the prosecution of other debtors; the fifth to the interest paid to creditors which is not to be more, in future, than 6 per cent., and to a proposal to exchange debts due to creditors for stock; the sixth to creditors unable so to 'subscribe'; and the seventh to the raising of a new stock of £100,000, the old being carried over at a 10 per cent. valuation.

This book is very well worth printing in full.

To return now to the other books of the first Company. They are a Home Journal[1] beginning 1662, a Home Ledger[2] beginning 1663 and numbered 2 in its series, a Gambia Journal[3] beginning 1665, a Jamaica Ledger of the same year and a Barbadoes Ledger of 1662,[4] and an outwards Invoice Book of 1663.[5] We may take this opportunity to say that the common form of all these documents had apparently been fixed long before. Thus the habitual opening of proceedings in a minute book :

'Meeting held . . . day . . . present . . .'

may be noticed before the middle of the fifteenth century, when in Privy Council Registers[6] we find :

'Thapparaunce' or *'Present'*

followed by a list of names. Similarly the system of double entry[7] had apparently become a school subject by the beginning of the sixteenth century, as may be seen from Mellis' 'Instructions,' reprinted in 1580 from a book of a much earlier date. Thus from the very first we may expect the African Company's Ledgers to have such entries as :

'Stockings Debtors to Thomas Thorneton'

or

'Negroe Slaves to Rum'

Their Waste Books—being rough drafts for the ledgers—to have the like entries ; and the Journals similarly to show already a fixed form. The Jamaica Ledger, though it relates to the earlier Company, opens with the words

The Accompt Current of the Royall African Company.

[1] *A.C. Rec.*, 309. [2] *Ibid.* 599. [3] *Ibid.* 544.
[4] *Ibid.* 1596 and 1564. [5] *Ibid.* 909.
[6] Cf. (*e.g.*) *Acts and Ordinances of the Privy Council*, vol. v. *passim*.
[7] It possibly came from Italy, as is sometimes suggested by the spellings of the word *Journal*. The *Records* of the very early Bank of St. George at Genoa, if they existed, would probably throw light on this question. Cabot's *Ordinances* (1553), quoted by Hakluyt, refer to 'a common leger to remain of Record for the Company.'

The first of our Companies came to an end in 1672; for valuable consideration and having regard to their heavy debts its members surrendered back their charter, as we have seen, and assigned all their former rights to a large new body of merchants, among whom, however, many of themselves found a place, who were incorporated by fresh patents under the title of the Royal African Company of England. This new body lasted till 1750, and of its fortunes during that time we shall have something to say later. At the present point we may note the extraordinary completeness of its records.

The second Company.

Taking first the class of copies of documents issued and received, we find a large number of classified letter books. There are 'General In-letter Books,' 'Special In-letter Books' (*e.g.* from the West Indies and from Home Correspondents), and a number of 'Abstract Letter Books,' for the Committees of Shipping, of Goods, of Accounts, and so forth. It is perhaps the fulness of these series, together with the clerks' habit of entering the purport of many letters read in the 'Minute Books,' that has led to the destruction of practically all the originals. The more important of these books—and indeed this may be said of other classes of the Records—either date from the beginning of the Company's life or have numbers showing that earlier ones existed but have perished. The 'Out Letters' are similarly complete and similarly classified. We have series for Africa (from 1685), for the Plantations (1687), for Home Correspondents, for Captains of Vessels and so forth.[1] Turning to the second class of Proceedings we have first to note that the 'Minutes' run in a full series from that of the earlier Company onwards: here again we have special books for Committees. Upon the other side of the Proceedings class—that of accounts—we have once more the fullest and most highly classified series to examine. Not only are there complete collections of ordinary 'Journals' and 'Warrant

[1] The number of Letter Books, thus elaborately classified, belonging to the second Company is fifty-five; of Minute Books sixty-eight.

Books' (from 1672), 'Waste Books' (from 1682, this being the fifth in the series) and 'Ledgers' (from 1673), with 'Invoice Books' both 'Inwards' and 'Outwards,' dating also from 1673, but we find again special books of the same kind sent home from Jamaica, Cape Coast Castle, and Gambia. Even this does not cover the whole ground of the Company's activities; for we have an array of books dealing with packets sent to Africa, special 'Soldiers'' or 'Garrison Ledgers,' dating from the earliest times, 'Cash Books' and 'Petty Cash Books' of the Company's Husband as the chief executive officer was called, and 'Customs Books.'[1] We shall have to deal later with the illustration of our Records by means of public ones; but the last series, which treat the Customs payments from the Company's point of view, are specially interesting as introducing us to a new series of Government records from which supplementary information as to the Company's proceedings may be drawn. I refer to a class new in another sense in that they have only within the last year become available for search at the Record Office—the very large series of 'Port Books'—books kept probably on the spot and serving subsequently as vouchers to the Collector's accounts—in which may be found entries of every ship, with its dutiable cargo, which cleared from the port concerned. I give by way of immediate illustration a single entry taken at random from a 'London Port Book.'

2 *Nov.* 1683

In Sarah Bonaventure, Tho: Woodfine, [the Master] ℔ Guiney Royal Comp[a] for Chaldrons Sea Coals, Lond[n] Measure. [duty] 1li xviis vjd.

Finally, to revert to our Company, though originals in the shape of letters are wanting, we have a number of rough books and in particular a few logs or journals of ships, the oldest that of the ship *Friesland*, 1674.[2]

[1] There are six Garrison Ledgers, twenty-six Cash Books, nineteen Petty Cash Books, and thirty-two Custom Books. With regard to Customs, see below, p. 215 note 2.

[2] *A.C. Rec.*, 1210.

The third Company.

In dealing with the Records of the third Company, which began life in 1750, I must begin by saying that it had, in a trading capacity, no corporate existence. So much we gather from a preliminary inspection of its patent: it was the Company of Merchants trading to Africa, not a trading body, but a body of traders.[1] Consequently, though some series of records continue those of the former Company (such, e.g. as the 'Minute Books' and, in a rather less numerous form, the 'Letter Books'), the London account books, 'Ledgers,' 'Journals' and 'Waste Books' disappear. On the other hand, not only do the African ones continue, the Cape Coast Castle ones forming a particularly fine set, but the African accounts in general are much more strictly and elaborately kept—thanks to very definite instructions from the 'Home Committee' as the 'Court of Assistants' has now become. Every fort of importance now has its 'Day Book' and its 'Garrison Ledger' or Pay List; and often an elaborate classified 'Abstract of Accounts'[2]; these are all sent home very regularly. Also the subsidisation of this third company by the Exchequer leads to the production of an Annual Balance Sheet, showing the expenditure of the public grant. Another new point about the new Company—a result of date—is the replacing of the old 'Cash Books' and 'Petty Cash Books' by 'Pass Books' with the Bank of England. A more important change is the preservation of original letters and accounts from all sources: and finally, among

[1] The most important attempt to compromise the matter of Interlopers: see below, pp. 210 and 214. The moving force is the Statute, 25 Geo. II, 40, which declared it lawful for all the king's subjects to trade between Cape Blanco and the Cape of Good Hope upon payment of an Entrance Fee of £2.

[2] There remain the Day Books and kindred accounts of eleven forts. There are also the Council Minute Books from Cape Coast Castle (1770–1818) and one earlier volume, very carefully kept according to instructions from the Home Committee (all Minutes, said one Rule, were to be entered in two books, each of which was to be signed and one of them to be sent home). These instructions applied also to the details of record keeping at the smaller forts.

this class, making the Company's records a complete exemplar of those of the State, we find the transferred class in numbers of undelivered or confiscated or unclaimed private letters and account books. I might perhaps add, in concluding this section, that the larger number of the more important books are carefully indexed; and that the Official Registers of the Company's Servants,[1] with the various posts held by each, particulars of their sureties, dates of appointments, and so forth, are exceptionally good in their kind: in the earlier period such information has to be collected from the 'Minute Books' and other sources.

The last point forms indeed a particularly good close to our consideration of this section of the subject. For while (as has been already said) the circumstances of the Companies' initiation—in particular the patents—give us the first suggestion of Records to come together with the limits within which their activities and (consequently) Records were confined, the employment and disposal of their staff is the key to the smaller details of their Muniments' structure.

IV.—Lines of Research in the Companies' Records

So much for the inner side of the Records of our three Companies. For the remainder of our space we may try to give some slight illustration of a few of the lines along which they respond to research, of the manifold activities which created them, and of the Public Records whose evidence supports their own.

The Slave Trade.

The line which presents itself most readily is perhaps that of the Slave Trade. Here we are embarrassed by the quantity of contemporary evidence in the form of a mass of printed books which it seems affectation to speak of as supplementary to our Records. Clarkson,

[1] *A.C. Rec.*, 1454–1456. There are also the earlier *Lists of Living and Dead at the Company's Forts, Lists of Passengers, Castle Charge Books*, etc. (Nos. 1423–1453).

Sharp and Wilberforce, Adam Smith and Thomas Day, Ramsay and Godwyn, Necker and Montesquieu, with the speeches of Burke, Pitt and the rest, and other parliamentary matter (including the Committee's report of 1793), not to mention the poets or the mass of party pamphlets [1]—these make an alarming collection for any one who wishes to write—it has not been done—the History of the African Slave Trade. The African Company, by the way, itself, by the mouth of its servants, appears as author : note too that it preserved amongst its archives the chief work of Wilberforce on the subject (his letter of 1807 to the Yorkshire electors) together with a suitable reply in the shape of Heron's *Letter to William Wilberforce on the justice and expediency of the Slave trade* of about the same date. Nor do supplementary Record sources—the State Papers, chiefly the Colonial ones—fail to supply us with a quantity of material.[2]

The people involved in this controversy may be divided into four classes ; the humanitarians pure and simple, the politic humanitarians, the extremists on the other side, and the ordinary anti-abolitionists. The first class may be represented by Clarkson ; they spoke much of the ' Man Trade ' : the second by Pitt and, I think, Wilberforce ; the latter is not perhaps generally placed in this class, but anyone who reads his works cannot fail to be struck with the fact that his arguments are directed almost entirely to the abolition of the trade, not of slavery : the third class consisted of individuals not now very important ; they spoke and thought of their opponents, the abolitionists, as revolutionaries and Jacobins : the fourth class consisted mostly of business men, like the members of the African Companies, whose interests were threatened. The first of these three classes bulks largely in great names and published works, but was it equally large as a body of opinion ? Considering the length of time for which the controversy

[1] See particularly the works of Clarkson, Wilberforce and Granville Sharp. The Pamphlets are referred to on p. 210, note 2 below.

[2] This matter of supplementary material is referred to again below.

endured, the equanimity of those interested in the decried trade is remarkable.

We received order from Mr. Thos. Thurloe [says a letter of 1679 from Virginia] to take into care the Refuge Negroes for the Royal African Company and to dispose of them for the best, which we shall doe . . . truly they are a sad parcell some of them soe old others soe Infirme that it is a shame that such negroes should be shipped aboard which serve only to anoy and destroy them of better value.[1]

'*In buying Negroes take special care they are healthy, sound and serviceable,*' is the only remark upon this subject of the trade in a long and highly moral list of instructions[2] (not omitting the daily prayers, the forbidding of drinking shops, and the Act with regard to profane swearing) issued by the Company to its factors later on. It was their point of view: for them, Negroes are the '*best traffick this country hath*' (pamphlet 1709) and incidentally they are taken out of '*a state of unenlightenment*' (I am quoting throughout from the Company's letters, minutes and so forth). It was their life: it had been practised from the earliest times of English trading, for instance under the sanction (as one of their writers says) of Cromwell: by the time of their incorporation it was their chief trade and is mentioned accordingly in their patent: one of the greatest strokes of business they ever did was the *Assiento*[3] of 1713 by which they had the monopoly of supplying the Spanish colonies; indeed all their official life was passed in securing for themselves, as against other Englishmen or foreigners, the monopoly of the trade: and it was, they continually pointed out, for the welfare of the Colonies and, through them, the prosperity of England, the one matter of trade essential to be maintained.

[1] *A.C. Rec.*, 1.

[2] *Ibid.*, 1530. These are the instructions quoted above.

[3] The ending of this (with the Company badly in debt to Spain) meant bankruptcy. *Cf.* Dubois.

If now we consider the duration of the abolition movement; that it was in progress, one may almost say, from the time of the Puritans till the end of the eighteenth century, and more particularly, with yearly contests and efforts and occasional half-measures of reform, from 1787 to 1807; we shall realise how much illustrative matter must be contained in the (very full) series of 'Letter,' 'Account' and 'Minute' Books and collections of correspondence—the whole dating from 1662—of Companies which were interested in very little else.

Prices.

One of many points which occur to the mind as naturally apt for such illustration is the question of *prices*: and I quote, at random, one out of numberless entries bearing upon this, from an Invoice Book beginning: '*Laus deo, in Jamaica* 1673.'[1]

	li.	s.	d.
Sold Geo. Hannay 1 woman	16.	0.	0.
Lt. Col. John Codrington (bills by this ship) 8 men 4 women	252.		
John Maddox, Esq. 12 men, 9 wo. 1 boy. 88,000 lbs. of sugar.			

Numbers.

Numbers again is one of the obvious points; and from 1755 to 1768 the Company kept a register of slaves exported. I would quote here, however, the heading of a detached document (again only one of many) to illustrate this:

> List of Number of Vessels, their Names, Tonnage and Number of men employed in navigating the same that arrived in the several ports of the British West Indies from Africa in the years 1795 and 1796 . . . . . together with an Account of the Number of Slaves that were taken aboard such vessels in Africa, the Number that Died, from that period to the Date of the ship's arrival in the West Indies and the number that were landed in each of the West Indies, distinguishing agreeably to the Act of Parliament their sexes, sizes, and ages.[2]

[1] *A.C. Rec.*, 936. [2] *Ibid.* 1574.

The Middle Passage.

We may let the same passage stand for another point of interest—the illustration of one of the chief arguments of the Abolitionists, the 'Horrors of the Middle Passage.' This and most of the other lists like it give details of the head-room between decks: that and the comparison between tonnage and crew on the one hand and cargo on the other give as reliable information as one could desire. But a great deal more upon this and other divisions of the same subject might also be gained from correspondence, particularly that with the customers of the slave market, and from scattered but numerous items in the accounts. The nature of such of our Records as bear on this topic is to supplement what has already been written, rather than themselves to find explanation in it; but particular reference may here be made to one work on the subject, that of Dubois.[1] Perhaps the chief importance of the African Company's documents is that they at once supplement and check the contemporary *oral* accounts, so largely used, for instance, by Clarkson, with the contemporary *written* accounts of men engaged in the trade, accounts often bearing only indirectly on the point at issue and not drawn up for publication (for, in fact, the information of posterity); and, similarly, to contrast the controversialists' *occasional* figures, or illustrate them, with more reliable *series*.

The History of the Companies.

We must not stay longer over the question of slavery but pass to some points of interest in the history of the Companies themselves, at which stage again a host of authorities, general and particular, contemporary and later, meets us. I might cite, by way of examples, Ellis' 'History of the Gold Coast,' Sir H. Johnston's 'Colonisation of Africa,' and Macpherson's 'Annals of Commerce,' and, again, works upon kindred subjects such as the Virginia, Hudson Bay and East India Companies. There is, I need hardly say, no special work upon our subject. But perhaps the most

[1] *Op. cit.*

remarkable mass of supplementary information is furnished by the contemporary pamphlets of which the British Museum has a large and representative collection. Without going too far into the matter at this point we may say that the whole history of the Companies' trade is from one point of view the history of their struggles with 'Interlopers,'[1] with constantly repeated attempts to disregard, or definitely to break, their monopoly: in the course of which struggle every point in their policy and conduct and in the fortunes of the trade becomes matter for long series of positive statements and equally positive denials in pamphlet form:[2] and for occasional Acts of Parliament.

The African Companies and English Foreign Relations.

We may conveniently divide the history of the Companies into various sections, and the first of these the places at which it touches this country's foreign politics. In introducing this we need make three chief observations. The first is that between 1662 and 1820 England was at war with France nine times, with the Dutch twice, with Spain six times, with America once; and that these wars were very largely indeed colonial and commercial. The second is that the French, the Portuguese and the Dutch had all arrived on the coast by the date of the first effective charter issued to an English Company (that of 1618), and that in 1744—a date which I take by reason of a convenient list, drawn up by a servant of the Company, of the forts then in existence, with their owners[3]—by that date there were nearly forty settlements on the coast, with generally from three to five miles separating one from another. The order of these

[1] 'Interlopers' was used here as in the case of the East India Company, both of foreign rivals in the trade and unauthorised English ones. The instructions sent by the Company to Captains of its ships always deal at length with this point: and there is constant allusion to the same in letters.

[2] See the large collections in the British Museum; for instance 8223 E, No. 26, which contains the words 'If ever any Paper was composed of a Rhapsody of Fictitious Positions and Fallacious Inferences, certainly this called "*Considerations on the Trade to Guinea*" is one'—a sufficient illustration of their general tone and usual title.

[3] Cf. *A.C. Rec.*, 67A.

possessions is thus given, from North to South: two French, one English, two Portuguese, two English, one Dutch, one German, one English, three Dutch, one English, one French, three English, one Dutch, three English, one Dutch, one English, one Dutch, one English, one Dutch, two English, one Dutch, one Danish, three English, one Dutch, one English. The possibilities in time of war are obvious; equally obvious is it that the winning, or losing, or building, or dismantling of a fort must necessarily figure in the letters of Factors or Agents to their Council at home. The history, for instance, of how the forts of Annamaboe, which was Dutch, and Whydah, which was French, became English, is the history of the relations, peaceful or warlike, of Dutch, French, and English on the coast. And I need hardly allude to the hostilities which in the 18th century involved Senegal on the French side and Gambia on the English, nor to the Dutch and Portuguese 'claims' at an earlier date, to which reference has already been made, nor to the formal exchanges and withdrawals made upon various occasions of peace making.[1]

This brings us to the third observation; which is that, obviously, meeting in our Records with so much marching and counter-marching, we shall turn for further information to the correspondence between the statesmen of the various nations involved—to the State Papers Foreign, particularly those relating to Holland and France. It is by its relations with the traders of other countries that a Trading Company comes most directly into contact with the Government of its own: and—a corollary—it is largely owing to these that we find supplementary illustration of its history in the ordinary Public Records. The State Papers Domestic, however, are also certain to include reference to the affairs of a Company so much involved in those of the nation, and with these we must not forget information scattered through the War Office Records; this last relates for the most part to the

[1] *E.g.* the Treaty of Versailles in 1783.

African Militia and the African Corps,[1] maintained, towards the end of our period, at the State expense. Here we touch upon the province of the Exchequer and Treasury, to which we shall have to refer again shortly. The Admiralty, too, has a bundle of original letters from our Company,[2] and, in its series of logs, must contain a considerable amount of scattered information. Last, but not least in importance, we notice a connection between our Companies and Parliament and may expect a corresponding appearance in the Parliamentary Records[3] and, more particularly, those of the Privy Council; the Company, indeed, preserved copies and registers of its own petitions[4] and of Orders in Council concerning itself. Of the Companies' influence upon English Colonial history we have perhaps said enough in speaking at length of their slave trade and of its maintenance by the requirements of the Plantations. I will add only that their connections in this matter were with the West Indies rather than North America, for the reason, perhaps, that the climate of the latter did not favour the direct importation of 'unseasoned' negroes.

Internal History of the Companies. Trade.

Reaching here the section of their history which deals with our Companies' own inner economy, I should like to have said something with regard to the large subject of records of the trade—in the strictest sense—done by them, but reasons of space forbid, and I must leave this practically untouched. On one side of it—the most important—slavery—I have already dwelt at some length. And I have said enough about the account side of the Companies' Records (when I mentioned also the 'Port Book' class among the Public Records) to make it plain without further illustration that information as to prices on the coast, money values

[1] Cf. *W.O.* 17/1162 *seq.* and other places.

[2] *Adm.*, 1/3810.

[3] Reference to some of the Statutes concerning the African Companies has already been made.

[4] *A.C. Rec.*, 169–177, dating from 1681 to 1777.

goods used in trade, mediums of exchange, and the like matters will be found perfectly set out in continuous series of the large and small books of all three Companies. They imported, besides slaves, dye-stuffs, ivory and gold, the latter perhaps the most important of the three, and the prices realised in London can generally be found: this is particularly the case when we come to the period of detached papers (1750–1820), when we often have printed lists of sales [1]: at this period we also get in the same place annual indents for stores required for the forts: and once again the same period provides us with annual balance sheets [2] and with a regular ledger and journal of what are called 'Forts and Settlements Accounts.' [3] I would add that much of the most interesting detail with regard to trade is often to be found in ships' journals, logs or books. Several such have remained among the miscellanea of the Companies, though nothing like the quantity to be found in the India Company's 'Marine Records.' Large numbers of such books must be in private possession: one appeared quite recently in the *Gentleman's Magazine*,[4] and a similar document is in the Library of this Society—the charges aboard the *African Galley* in a voyage from London to Guinea, 'from thence to Virginia and from thence back to London.' This last is apparently a draft for a document to be exhibited in some process at law and may be used here as an indication of yet another class of Public Records which may, on occasion, illustrate our subject.[5]

[1] *Ibid.* 1515, a printed list of goods to be sold 'by the candle,' is the earliest example of this.

[2] *Ibid.*, 905–907. The balance sheet for 1804, to take an example, shows Total Receipts £18,441 7*s.* 11*d.*, of which £17,540 4*s.* 0*d.* is contributed by the Treasury, while £4 is from Entrance Fees. It is signed by the Committee and the Cursitor Baron of the Exchequer. A list in *A.C. Rec.*, 1601, makes the total of the Grants between 1750 and 1815 £963,000.

[3] *Ibid.* 357–359.

[4] February 1906.

[5] At least one actual Record of the Company contains a note that it was produced in evidence upon some legal occasion.

Before leaving the topic of internal history we may perhaps be allowed to emphasise one constant factor in the growth and decay of all three Companies, though we have touched on it more than once. In our first cursory glance at the history of the English African trade we noticed particularly one thing, the struggle for and against a monopoly: in the earliest Minute Book extant we discovered at once the prominence of this matter: and in referring to contemporary printed authorities, when we found that the most important class was provided by a mass of pamphlets, we were dealing with little save this same question. In good or bad circumstances of these Companies, the strict maintenance of the members' right not only to trade themselves but also to keep out all except their fellow members was always on the one hand a panacea, on the other a stumbling-block. It was a question which never ceased to be vexed until the trade to Africa was finally 'opened.'[1]

The Companies' monopoly.

The last period of our history is one of dwindling commercial and increasing national importance. Not only have the forts in Africa to be maintained, but only an increasingly heavy subsidy from the State keeps alive the final Company of Merchants Trading to Africa (1750–1820).[2] In the Records of the Company this last period is naturally fruitful in exact accounts of Establishment Expenditure in Africa; and it is hardly necessary to refer to the Treasury, Audit Office and Exchequer of Receipt Records to trace the payment out and checking of the various sums of public money thus ex-

Subsidisation.

[1] See above, p. 195 and p. 204 note 1. According to Scott, *op. cit.*, pp. 22 *seq.*, even the first Company, which was highly successful up to 1678, and moderately so for another twelve years, began to decline towards the close of the eighteenth century after an organised attack upon its monopoly in 1692, and Exchequer subsidisation was necessary to maintain the Company (and the forts) long before the third Company was started in 1750.

[2] See above, p. 213 note 3. By the Act of 1750 the moneys granted were carefully apportioned, only £800 going to Office expenses. See also Note 68 below.

pended.[1] But this side of our subject has already been dealt with under the head of foreign relations: when we also noted the appearance of our Companies in 'Treaties.' It remains to notice that the visible growth of an ever closer relationship with the State may lead us further to find some material, as indeed we have already done in the Statutes, from those of William and Mary and of Anne (affecting the second Company) to the later ones culminating in the final Act of 1 and 2 George IV, to which allusion has already been made.[2]

Stock, Stockholders and Members.

With regard to the Company itself, in the strictest sense of the word, I need say little. The question of its stock has been worked out from the earliest date to 1750—when there ceased to be a joint stock—by Mr. Scott.[3] In the journals and other books specially relating to stock (Ledgers, Journals, Transfer Books) and in the printed and MS. lists of members—these last extending practically through the period I have dealt with—we have all that the Records offer with regard to the people who formed the Company. The executive part of it may, of course, be pursued further in the Minute Books and, where they exist, in the Home Letter Books.

History of the Coast.

Touching now for a moment the local history—the extent to which the Company's records illustrate the growth of British West Africa—I need hardly point out that these records must necessarily be the chief authority on this point for the period they cover—the history of that development being the history of the relations

[1] The Pipe Office and Audit Office *Declared Accounts* run from 'the King's Adventurer with the Company of Adventurers. . . .' (1661), through the moneys 'imprested' to the African Company for the support of trade (*c.* 1730), down to the expenditure (1822–1826) on the 'settlement late under the Management of the African Company.'

[2] The first instance of Parliamentary interference was the Statute 9 and 10 William and Mary, which contained an attempt to deal with the 'Interloper' difficulty on the basis of a percentage payment by way of customs. A good instance of less direct Statute interference will be found at the time of the treaty of Versailles (1783). See p. 211 above.

[3] *Loc. cit.* Lists of members will be found in *A.C. Rec.*, 1507–1510.

in Africa of England and the other Powers lodged there.[1] This matter I have already referred to in dealing with the points at which English foreign relations are touched by the history of our Companies. I may add, however, that in the later portion of our Records—1750–1820—we have among the detached papers constant occurrences of schedules generally entitled ' State and condition ' of such and such a fort. To this must be added the local Accounts Books already referred to and the information which can be gleaned from letters sent home to the Company about the state of native politics and the opinions of the English factors upon native problems.[2]

The Companies in Africa.

This brings us to a final point in the history of the Companies—the material which we have for the history of their servants. Part of this may be read in the formal letters of these to the Company and in the Registers of Living and Dead at the Company's forts; much more in the private letters and even letter books which have sometimes survived to us from the time of the last Company. From one or the other source we have their likes and dislikes, their illnesses, visits home, the ships they travelled on, the details of their table, and the poems they scrawled to their friends. We know that they were badly paid and that they were naturally tempted, as their fellows in India were, to private trade—a temptation to which they sometimes yielded, if we may judge from the frequency with which such trading was forbidden. Ill-health in a bad climate, regret at leaving England (a regret not perhaps shared by their friends in all cases), the hopelessness of fortune unless by the aid of preliminary funds, or a capital

[1] See p. 211 above: the Dutch held at one time Secondee, Dixcove, Apollonia, Accra and Cape Coast Castle. No doubt, too, there was often a state of actual warfare between the traders of different nations in times of nominal peace. A seventeenth-century letter refers to the capture of an ' Interloper ' as a matter ' not propper for every common peruser.'

[2] One such correspondent thinks ' the Dutch way is the best: if trade is wanting to have other Nations [*i.e.* African tribes] fall upon them that are false and cutt them to pieces.'

of goods and subsequent private trading—these must frequently have been the staple reflections of the Company's servants in Africa.

This side of the Companies' history is perhaps not very historical. In any case it is not likely to be dealt with deeply by subsequent writers; and I will venture to give two extracts which, though they are in themselves of no public interest and though the second is open, on the other hand, to the charge of being of sentimental interest, yet illustrate many of the points that have been noted in this Paper. Both in different ways sum up, as a single document may sometimes do, a whole life—and even character.

The first is the page in the Company's Register which gives official details of one of its most distinguished servants.[1]

There is no doubt that in some way which cannot be attached to his salary he made a fortune.[2] He was one of three brothers in the same service.

The second consists of extracts from a private letter. The writer and addressee appear to have been distant cousins as well as husband and wife; of good family; and the husband a ne'er-do-well: he apparently went out in 1785 and almost immediately wrote trying to get some trading goods from his wife's relations, if they could do nothing else for him.

[1] *A.C. Rec.*, 1456.

[2] A large amount of correspondence between the brothers remains among the Companies' papers and a number of their private account books. Richard appears to have been connected with the Committee after his retirement from the service. The more important articles of trade (gold, ivory, and slaves) the Company's servants were specifically forbidden to touch in their private capacities. There is little doubt that in spite of these rules, even strengthened by Parliamentary authority, the servants did meddle privately in some or all of these, as well as in the lesser local barterings which were, perhaps, left open to them.

Name of Officer	Station	By whom appointed	When appointed	Dates of commission	Salary	Securities	Occurrences
1. Richard Miles	Writer . . .	Governor and Council	1765. July 5		£60		1770. Augt. 17th. To take place from the 16th March, 1769, when appointed a Governor on the Coast.
1782 No. 1	Factor	Do.	,, Augt. 20		£80		
	Deputy Secretary	Do.	1768. Decr. 25		£130		
	Factor at Prampram . . .	Do.	1769. Jany. 15		£80		Suspended the 25th Septemr. 1771.
	Chief of Succondee	Do.	,, March 16		£100	Himself . . £3000	Reinstated the 30th July 1772.
	Chief of Dixcove	Do.	,, June 20		£100	William Miles £1000	
	Chief of Appolonia	Do.	1770. Augt. 11		£100	Gilbert Petrie £1000	
	Chief of Tantumquerry . . .	Do.	1771. April 1		£100		
	Chief of Accra .	Do.	1775. May 1		£100		
	Chief of Annamaboe	Do.	,, May 16		£200	Bonds dated 1st Janỹ, 1777	
						Himself . . £5000	
	Governor of Cape Coast Castle						1779. August 5th. Suspended at the Arrival of the Gascoyne from all his offices.
	President of the Council and Warehouse-keeper	Do.	1777. Jany. 1	1777. Jan. 1	£400	William Miles / John Shoolbred £5000	
	Governor of Cape Coast Castle					Bonds dated 10th Octor 1781	1781. Octor. 10. Restored to his Rank, Offices and to his Salary from the Date of his Suspension. Resigned 1st Jany 1784.
	President of the Council	Committee	1781. Octor 10	As above.		Himself . . £5000	
	Treasurer and Warehouse-keeper					Christr. Chambers / Anthy. Calvert £5000	

My Dear Dan,

I would have wrote to you long before this but was seting off for Dublin the next day after I received your letter where I now am at my Sisters house I was taken so ill after I came here that I was sure I came to die here. . . . I put off writing to you tell I should have an opertunity of speak to my uncle . . . . I am sorry his answer was not what I would wish it to be . . . . it was not in his power to get you any place and he said he blived you ware mad if you even could get leave of absence to think of leaveing a place that you had only just got . . . . people must not expect to make a fortune in a hurry as for the things you wrote to him for I never hear a word about them my sister told me she blived he had not money and every one seemed to think it very foolish to send such lumber as you mentioned . . . . I am told there was a Leady at my uncles the day he received your letter that said if she was the chief Barron and had £50 or £60 to throw away she would much rather give it to Mr. Okeeffes poor wife and children than to seind it hop of the Vinter to Mr. Okeeffe . . . . he was very well able to take care of himself and give himself very little trouble about anybody else but what sweet words he gave I am a feared my unkle is angry with me . . . . the last day I dined at forthfield he hardly spoke to me God help me I am to bear the blunt of every thing I am sure I am hartily tired of this world if it was pleased God to call me for I am sure I have no reason to wish to live as I never expect to see you . . . . I have disobliged every one belonging to me on your acount and what is worse I blive you care as little for me as the rest . . . . if I lived 100 years I never should forget the unkind manner you left me tho you did not forget to call to see your Nurs and wish her a good by but thank God she has shone herself in her true collers . . . . My dear Dan if I have been a little sevare I hope you will excuse it when you consider it is from a will that loves you too well . . . . I have nothing to console me for your absence but my two dear little boys who I hope will afford me a great deal of Pleasure and happiness if it be Gods will to spare them to me and to mark them with grace. I send you a lock of poor Dickson and of my little Darling Barry Dans hair [1] and a lock of my own as the ownly preasant I can make you . . . . little barry Dan . . . . is so sweet a little creature . . . . and so devarting . . . . I mite have some enfluence over my uncle but . . . . I blive I

[1] Still enclosed in the document.

am quite out of his books but do not wonder at it when he thinks howe much he lost by me and I not a bit the better for it . . . . with two children and nothing to maintain them but Depending on him but I will try to be satisfide with my lot and wait with peatiance for a hapyer day . . . . I wish you would write to her [*her sister*] and return Mr. Mc Mahan thanks for his care and attention of me I am sure he behaved like a brother to me if your brothers behaved half so well to me I would have little reson to complain of them but there is little frinship without intrest to be found in this world . . . . I will write to you as soon as I go home and let you know all the newse of the Contry I desireed you in my last letter niver to throuble Mr. L. Curran with a nother letter . . . . the last letter you wrote him he left in the post office and told Will Gormon he would not relace it any letter you write me I wish you would direct to my sister as I do not like to trouble my Grandmother for money to relace them . . . . I will put an end to this letter with asureing you that where ever I am or where ever I go I will be allways your loveing and affectinate wife

SARAH OKEEFFE.

Dublin Monday february the 22, 1787.

The Register informs us that Daniel O'Keefe had died in May 1786.

V.—CONCLUSION

I venture to hope that the present Paper has shown a large amount of documentary evidence of all kinds falling into classes which will appear very natural, unartificial ones. If it has I would emphasise in conclusion the fact that they will all be found to be based entirely upon one thing—an examination of what we may expect in the light of the preliminary study we are able to make: this preliminary study being a study of the Companies (the Record producing force) in (*a*) Parallel cases among public and private Records. (*b*) Contemporary narrative history. (*c*) The acts—the charters—which created and moulded the Companies; which, as a consequence, defined and regulated their activities; and which, by a further natural consequence, are seen to be responsible also for their History and their Records.

INDEX

Abergavenny, 141
Abbott, Thomas, 152
A'Court, William, 67
Acrington, Robert de, 95
Africa, bibliography of the Companies in, 192, 209
— Companies, records of the, 188–220
— Companies, their history, 210–217
— inauguration of the Companies, 194, 195
— Minute Books of the first Company, 199, 200, 201
— second Company in, 201–203
— study of English companies, 192
— the Companies servants, 216–220
— the first Company, 198, 199, 200, 201
— the third Company, 204–217
— — its stock, 215
African House, Throgmorton Street, 200
Agriculturists, 108
Alexander I., *see* Russia
— III., *see* Scotland, king of
— Sir William, 16
Alliance, Austrian, 78, 79, 80–87
— Holy, 70, 74, 75
— Quadruple, 70, 83, 85, 88
Anglesey, *see* Annesley
Annamaboe, fort of, 211
Annesley, Arthur, Earl of Anglesey, 200
Antrim, 12, 15
Apparator, the, 39, 40
Appropriators, the, 91, 96
Argyllshire, 5
Armstrongs, the, 4
Assiento, the (1713), 207
Augsburg, Imperial Diet of, 176, 177
Augustus, Sigismond, *see* Poland
Austria, attitude of, towards Turkey, 72
Austria, Emperor of, 69
— represented at the Vienna Congress, 66, 76
Avenbury, 96
Awre, Vicar of, 96
Ayenbite of Inwyt, 117
Aylesbury, 141

Bagot, Sir Charles, 68
Baillie, Robert, 42
Ballads of the reign of Charles I., 19–64
— against ecclesiastical jurisdiction, 38, 39, 40, 40 *n.*
— — Puritans, 35, 35 *n.*, 36, 37, 39
— — — corn-hoarders, 31
— — the extension of London, 29, 30
— naval, 21, 28
— of common life, 27, 28
— 'of Lord Willoughby,' 21
— 'Of the Angel Gabriel,' 21
— on adventures of war, 25, 26
— — Buckingham's expedition to France, 22, 22 *n.*
— — —assassination, 22 *n.*, 23
— — Cromwell's capture of London, 56, 57, 57 *n.*
— — deliverance of the king to Parliament, 55, 55 *n.*, 59
— — ecclesiastical matters, 33, 34, 43 *n.*

Ballads of Gustavus Adolphus, 25, 25 *n.*
— — Hampden's policy, 51
— — murders and executions, 27, 27 *n.*
— — pageants, 27, 27 *n.*
— — Princes Rupert and Maurice, 51
— — Pym, 47, 48
— — religious differences during the Civil War, 52–55, 52 *n.*, 53 *n.*, 55 *n.*
— 'Song of the Siege of Hereford,' 50
— — Tromp's victory in the Channel, 26, 27
— — the Acts of the Long Parliament, 42, 42 *n.*, 43, 43 *n.*, 44, 45, 46, 47, 47 *n.*, 48
— — assassination of Dr. Lambe, 23
— — battle of Edgehill, 51, 59
— — — Lansdown, 50
— — — Powick Bridge (1642), 50
— — — Preston, 63, 63 *n.*
— — — of Roundway, 50
— — — Stratton, 50
— — the Civil War, 48, 49, 49 *n.*, 50
— — the death of the Earl of Strafford, 44, 44 *n.*, 45
— — the draining of the Fens, 31, 32, 32 *n.*
— — the execution of the king, 63, 63 *n.*, 64, 64 *n.*
— — the expedition to Cadiz, 19, 20, 20 *n.*
— — the ill-equipment of the army, 20, 20 *n.*, 21
— — the king, 59, 59 *n.*
— — the king's captivity, 60, 61, 62
— — the king's return from Scotland, 46
— — the marriage of Charles I., 19
— — the overthrow of the coaches, 28, 29
— — the Puritan settlement in New England, 37
Ballads of the quarrel between Parliament and the Army, 55, 55 *n.*, 56, 57, 57 *n.*
— — the royal visit to Scotland, 27, 27 *n.*
— — the Scottish rebellion, 40, 40*n.*, 41, 42
— — the siege of Chester, 51
— — — Colchester, 63, 63 *n.*
— — — Rochelle, 23, 24, 24 *n.*
— the suppression of libellous, 33
— — the Thirty Years' War, 20–21, 23, 25, 25 *n.*, 26
— — the Treaty for Peace, 31, 52, 52 *n.*
— 'The Banbury Song,' 50
Baltic, English traders in the, 163–184
Banbury, 50
Bannockburn, battle of, 8
Baranowski, 180
Barkstead, Sir John, 136, 137
Bathory, Stephen, *see* Poland
Batt, Christopher, 151
Battles: Bannockburn, 8
— Culloden, 7
— Edgehill, 51, 59
— Kilsyth, 7
— Lansdown, 50
— Naseby, 51
— Newbury, 51
— Newburn (1640), 41
— Newport (1601), 21
— North Inch (Perth), 4
— Powick Bridge (1642), 50
— Preston, 63
— Roundway (1642), 50
— Stratton (1642), 50
Beale, Robert, 177
Beccles, charter for, 130
Beck, Gabriel, 131
Beeston Regis, parish of, 102, 103 *n.*
Bence, Alderman, 200
Benin, 193
Berwick, 5, 8
Berzevicius, *see* Transylvania
Bewdley, 35
Big, Mr. James, 144
Black Death, the, 89, 89 *n.*, 113, 115

Blagrave, Daniel, 136, 138
— John, 138
Blandford, 141
Bonaparte, Napoleon, 66, 79, 87
— — his return from Elba, 73
Bourbons, 74
Bovates, 104
Brackston, William, 135, 138
Branford, 140
Broase de, family of, 148
Braunsberg, 182
Bremen, 171
Brereton, Peter, 131
Bricks, John, 166
Brightwaltham, 111
Bruce, Robert, 8, 12
Brunne, Robert of, 98, 117
Bucharest, 72
Buckingham, *see* Villiers
Buckworth, John, 200
Bulstrode, Richard, 138
Burke, Edmund, 206
Burnet, 60
Burningham, Peter, 138
Bury, Richard de, 98
Bury St. Edmunds, charter of, 154
Butter, poet, 53
Butts, 105

Canterbury, Archbishop of, *see* Sudbury
Cape Blanco, 194
— of Good Hope, 195
Carisbrooke Castle, 61
Carlisle, 134
Carpenter's house, 97, 97 *n.*
Castles, Carisbrooke, 61 *n.*
— Warwick, 50
Castlereagh, *see* Stewart
— alliance with Metternich, 75–76
— his alliance with Austria, 78–79, 80–87
— — documents and papers, 65, 66, 67
— — estimate of Metternich, 77–78
— — negotiations for peace, 69–75, 87
— — policy of peace, 66
Castlereagh, towards Russia, 79–82, 87
— — 'Projet de Declaration,' 68–75
— — relations with Metternich, 75–85
Cathcart, Sir William Schaw, Earl Cathcart, 67
Cecil, Edward, Viscount Wimbledon, 20
Chaplain, William the, 95
Chaplains, stipendiary, 90, 91, 113
Charles I., *see* England, kings of
— V., Emperor, 170–172, 176, 177
Charter, Colchester, discussion concerning, 134–135
— Cromwell's 'May Fair,' 150
— — to Salisbury, 151–154
— granted to English traders, 166
— 'Rumpers,' 145
— to Eton College, 149
Charters, classification of, 132–133
— Commonwealth, Salisbury, 129
— disappearance of, 145, 147
— discovery of, 149
— municipal, during the Commonwealth, 129, 130
Chepstow, 141
Chester, charter of, 130, 131, 146
— siege of, 51
Chipping Wycombe, 141
— — charter of, 133
Churchyard, the mediæval, 93, 96
Clancarty, Earl, *see* Trench
Clan Chattan, 4
— Kay, 4
Clarkson, Thomas, 206
Clerk, Matthew the,
Cleveland, John, poet, 35, 44, 53
Cloth trade, 168, 170, 175, 182, 184
Clergy, country, 90–112
— parish, as agriculturists, 108
— — — huntsmen, 98
— — — landowners, 102–108, 102 *n.*, 103 *n.*, 104 *n.*
— — education of, 118, 119, 124, 125
— — grades of the, 115
— — hospitality of, 97, 114

Clergy, records concerning, 89, 90
— — social status, 117, 118
— — sources of income, 100, 112
— — stipends of the, 89, 89 *n.*
— — their position, 90, 91
— — — tithes, 100, 101
— town, 90, 112
Civil War (1642), commencement of, 48
Codrington, John, Lt.-Col., 208
Cogg's Mill, 105
'Coign' and 'Livery,' 10
Colchester, 141
— charter of, 133
— siege of, 63
Cologne, 170
Colonies, in 17th and 18th centuries, 210–211
Commerce, Scottish, 4, 5
Committee, of Charitable uses, 153
— for Corporations, 129, 130
— — municipal charters, 131, 132, 145
— — the advance of money, 130
Companies, African, 189–220
— — its servants, 216–220
— — the first, 198–201
— — — second, 201–203
— — — third, 204–217
— — — — its stock, 215
— — their monopolies, 214
— and the American Colonies, 192
— bibliography of, 192, 209, 215
— East India, 189, 190, 191, 194, 198
— Governor and Company of Adventurers of London, 194, 195
— Hudson Bay Company, 192, 198
— internal history of, 212, 213
— Italian, 194
— mining, 194
— Muscovy, the, 198
— Nova Scotia, the, 194
— Russian, 194
— Virginia, the, 194, 198
Connaught, 12
Constantinople, 73, 77, 79, 84
Cooper, Anthony Ashley, 152
Corbet, Doctor, 223
Corbett, Richard, 35
Corporation Act, 153
Corunna, 26
Coumbe, 105
Covenanters, the, 15
Cowley, Abraham, poet, 53
Coxe, Col., 146
Craven, William, Earl of Craven, 200
Cromwell, Oliver, 32, 32 *n.*, 53, 56, 134, 143, 145, 207
— — his appointment of major-generals, 131
— — — death, 137
— — proclaimed Protector, 137
— Richard, 137, 149, 150
Culloden, battle of, 7

Dantzic, appeal to Poland, 171, 172, 173, 174, 178, 179
— its appeal to Denmark, 165, 166
— its trade, 163, 164, 165
— its measures against England, 170, 171, 173, 178
— policy of condemned, 181, 183
— rivalry of with Elbing, 163, 164, 165, 178, 183
— tolls at, 182
Darien Company, the, 16
David, Matthew, 150
Dawkins, Roland, major-general, 150
Day, Thomas, 206
Denbigh, charter of, 154
Denham, Sir John, poet, 44, 53
Denmark, attitude of, towards Baltic trade, 165, 166
— king of, Frederick II., 165, 166
Desborough, John, major-general, 131, 141
D'Ewes, Sir Symonds, diary of, 25
Diary, nature of a, 186, 186 *n.*
Diets, Hanseatic, 171, 173, 174, 176, 177, 178
Diplomacy, European, in the nineteenth century, 66, 67
Diplomatists, English, on the Continent, 67, 68

Diplomatic, English, studies in, 185
Directory, the,
Doncaster, 154
— charter of, 154
Dore, Abbot, and convent of, 96
Dovecot, 96
Dover, Robert, 35
Drake, Sir Francis, 20
Drapers, charter granted to, 147
Droitwich, charter of, 154
Dunedin, Scots settlement in, 16
Durham, 42, 141
— College of, 146

Eastland Company, attempts to trade in the Baltic, 163–184
—— beginning of the, 166, 174, 175
—— growth and prosperity of, 184
—— its privileges, 175
—— treaty with Elbing, 178, 179, 181, 182, 183
Ecclesiastical Commission (1648), 54
Edgehill, 51, 59
Edward II., *see* England, kings of
— III., *see* England, kings of
Edwards, Thomas, 54
Elba, 73
Elbing, arrival of English merchants in, 166
— Commission held at, 180–183
— growth of harbour, 184
— its trade, 163
— negotiations with English traders, 164, 175
— port of, 164
— rivalry with Dantzic, 163, 164, 165, 178, 183
— threatened by the Hanseatic League, 174
— tolls fixed at, 182, 183
— treaty with Eastland Company, 178, 179, 181, 182, 183
Eliot, Sir John, 25
Elizabeth, Princess, *see* England
Elmira, 192
Embden, 176
England, kings of, Charles I., accession and marriage, 19
—— his execution, 63
—— II., 134
—— Edward II., 113
—— VI., 22
—— Henry V., 22, 117
—— John, 148
—— James II., 150
—— Princess Elizabeth of, 64
— queens of, Elizabeth, 166, 168, 170, 171, 173, 174, 176, 177, 178, 182
—— Henrietta Maria, her entry into London, 19
— relations with foreign powers, 66
Eskdale, 12
Esterhazy, prince Paul, 82, 83, 85, 86
Estover, 107
Eton College, 149
Ettrick, Lord of, 6
Exeter, grant of charter to, 130
Eyre, Henry, 151, 154

Fairfax, Thomas, baron, 56
Fanshawe, Sir Richard, poet, 44
Farnese, Alexander, duke of Parma, 172, 177
Felton, John, 22 *n.*, 23
Fens, draining of the, 31
Field-names, 105–106
Fiennes, Nathaniel, Col., 50
Firley, family of, 181
Ford, Simon, 135
Forts, African, 194, 210, 211, 214
Fowler, Mr. Christopher, 135
Foxwist, William, 150
Framework knitters, 142
France, expedition to Isle of Rhé (1627), 22
— her position in the Vienna Congress, 66, 70, 76
— war with (1626), 22–24
Frauenburg, 182
Frederick II., *see* Denmark
Frischhafen, *see* Svieza, gulf of

GALLEYS, Portuguese, 193
Gambia, 192, 193, 211
— Journal, 201
Games, Cotswold, 35
Garciones, 92
Garden, herb, 96
Gateshead, 141
— charter of, 146, 147
Gentz, F., 70
Germany, English recruits in (1625), 19
Gerrard, Mr., 135
Gilpin, Dr. George, 176
Glasgow, Historical Exhibition at, 1, 2, 16, 17
Glebe, 100, 101, 102
Gloucester, 141
— charter of, 147
— municipal charter, 149
— *see* Stuart
Godwin, Morgan, 206
Godwyn, *see* Godwin
Gore, Captain, 20
Gorney, Thomas, 166
Goskin, Henry, 33, 34
Government, Instrument of (1653), 131
Graham, James, Marquis of Montrose, 7
Grahams, the, 4, 12
Gray, Jerome, 144
— Matthew, 166
Greek insurrection, 87
Greenland, 26
Grey, Mr., 200
Grimesmede, meadow, 105
Grosvenor, Col., 140
Guinea, trade in, 192, 193, 194
Gustavus Adolphus, *see* Sweden

HAKLUYT, 190, 191, 192
Hamburg, Hanseatic League at, 171, 176, 177
— merchant adventurers at, 165, 167, 170, 184
Hammond, Robert, Col., 137 *n.*
Hampden, John, 51
Hannay, George, 200
Hanseatic League, 164, 165, 167, 168, 169, *and passim*
— — decline of the, 176, 184
— — privileges of the, 168
Hardenburg, Baron, 70
Harley, Sir Edward, 140
Harptree, West, vicar of, 96
Hawking, 97, 98
Hawkins, John, 193
Hawley, Lord (1670), 200
Herbert, George, 59
— John, 177, 180, 182
Hebrides, 5
Hemel Hempstead, 141, 145
Henrietta Maria, *see* England, queens of
Henry V., *see* England, kings of
Hereford, elections at, 140
— Lugg Meadow at, 140
— siege of, 51
Herrmann, Daniel, 172
Hides, 104
Highway, 106
Hispaniola, slave trade in, 193
History, documents of nineteenth century, 65
Historical Exhibition (Glasgow), 1, 2, 16, 17
Holland, English recruits in (1624), 19–21
— its trade in Africa, 195, 199.
Huron territory, Scots settlement in, 16
Husbandry, elements of Scottish, 13–15
Hyde, Robert, 153

INDIES, West, 208
India, East, Company, its records, 189, 189 *n.*, 190, 191, 198
Inverness, 5, 11
Iona, statutes of, 12
Ipswich, 141
— charter of, 131
Ivie, John, 152

JAMAICA, 201
James II., *see* England

James VI., *see* Scotland
Jennings, Robert, 135
John, *see* England, kings of
Jones, John, 131
— Philip, 150
— William, 150

Karnkowski, Stanislaw, 179
Kelsey, Thomas, major-general, 140
Kelso, rental of (1290), 13
Kilsyth, battle of, 7
King's Lynn, 141
— — charter of, 133, 143, 144
Kintyre, 15
Kloczewski, Peter, 164
Königsberg, 164, 166
Krüdener, Barbara Juliane von, 74

Lambe, Doctor, 23
Lambert, John, 131
Lansdown, 50
La Rochelle, siege of (1628), 23, 24, 24 *n.*
Lathom, Mr., 140
Laud, *see* London, bishop of
Laws of the Marches (1249), 4
Ledgers, of the African Companies, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 208, 213, 215
Leeds, 141
— charter of, 134
— charters, 146
Lembke, Henry, 133
Licence system, in England, 167, 168
Licensing Act, 154
Lindsey, Earl of, 23, 24
Lisemann, George, 167, 170, 171, 173, 175
Lisle, John, 131
Liston, Sir Robert, 73
Lithuania, Stephen Bathory in, 171, 179
Llanthony, Prior and convent, 96
London, Austrian dispatches sent to, 77
London, bishop of, Laud, William, 34, 40, 43, 44, 45, 52
— 'Blackfriars,' 85
— Bridewell prison, 34
— occupation of, by Cromwell, 56, 57, 58
— Charing Cross, 52
— Cheapside Cross, 52
— Common Council of, 129
— elections at, 141
— 'Exchange' (1625), 19
— extension of, 29, 30
— Fleet prison, 33
— Holborn, 33
— Inns of Court, 27
— Lord Mayor of, 47, 56, 57, 129
— Smithfield, 27
— steelyard in, 167
— the Guildhall, 48, 49
— Throgmorton Street, African House, 200
— Tower Hill, 52
— Tower of, 45, 57
— Tyburn, 48, 56
— Westminster, 140, 141
— Whitehall Gate, 144
Lovelace, John, baron, 155
Lubartow, 180
Lübeck, 167, 169, 170, 171, 176
Lublin, Congress at, 180
Luneburg, Congress at, 174
Lunsford, Sir Thomas, 50
Lyme Regis, 141
— — charter of, 131
Lynn Market, 31

MacDonnells, the, 12, 15
Maddox, John, 208
Madrid, 77, 79
— treaty of (1629), 24 *n.*
Maidstone, 140
Maintenance, sword and cap of, 153
Major-Generals, appointment of, 131
— — influence of, 134, 138, 139, 142
Malcolm Canmore, 12
Manby, Thomas, 131
Mansfeld, Ernest, Count de, 19–21

Marchant, Roger, 95
Marchers, Lord, 148
Marches of Wales, 8
— laws of the, 4
Market, open, at Reading, 137
Maurice, Prince, 51
Meadow, John de Bley's, 105
Meadow, vicarage, 96, 105, 106–107
Merchant adventurers, the, 163, 165, 167, 177
Metternich, Clemens Wenzel Nepemuk Lothar, Prince, 67, 70
— alliance with Castlereagh, 75, 76, 79, 80
— his character, 77, 78
— — policy towards England, 82, 87
— hostility towards Russia, 79, 82, 83, 86
Middle Passage, the, 209
Möller, Mathias, 165
Monopolies, the, 42, 43
— study of, 189, 190, 214
Montesquieu, Charles de Secondat, baron, 206
Montrose, *see* Graham
Muscovy, 169, 171, 172, 173

Naples, 77
Napoleonic war, 68
Naseby, 51
Necker, James, 206
Newark, siege of, 50
Newburn, 41
Newbury, 155
New England, 37
Newport, *see* battles, 146
Nevill, Henry, 138
Noreis, Roger le, 105
Norse settlement, in the Hebrides, 5
North Inch (Perth), 4
Northumberland, *see* Percy
Norwich, 141
— disturbances at, 155

Offices, municipal, 130, 135, 137, 139, 150, 151
Orchards, mediæval, 95, 96
Ordeal of battle, 4
Osmonton, Martha, 33
Ostfrisia, Count of, 171, 177
Oxford, Charles I. at, 59
— Council of, 89 *n.*

Page, Mr., 136
Pale-toll (Pfahl-zoll), 183
Paris, peace of, 76
Parish clergy, and marriage, 120–123
— in town and country, 90
— the mediæval, 89–128
Park, the lord's, 95
Parker, Martin, 28, 41
Parliament:
— of 1628, 22, 22 *n.*, 23
— — 1640, 41, 42, 46
— the Long, 151
— — Acts of the, 41–48
— — quarrel of with the army, 55–58
Parma, prince of, *see* Farnese
Parmenter, Thorold the, 95
Pasture, a close under, 107
— common of, 107
Peace, negotiations for, 69–75, 87, 88
Percy, Algernon, Earl of Northumberland, 27
Petitioning, Act against promiscuous, 154
Pincun, Henry, 105
Pitt, William, the younger (1790), 206
Pledges, 111
Poland, alliance with Elbing, 163, 164, 165
— king of, Bathory, Stephen, 164, 167, 168, 169, 170, *and passim*
— — — — — war with Russia, 169
— — — Sigismund III., 184
— — — — Augustus, 164
— relations with Saxony, 66, 69
Poly, Walter, 95
Porte, refusal of negotiations of peace, 73
— rupture between Russia, and the, 69, 72

Portreeve, office of, 130
Portsmouth, 23
Portugal, its trade in West Africa, 192, 193, 195
Powick Bridge, 50
Preston, 63
Price, Laurence, 28
Printers, of Norwich, 155
Prussia, attitude towards England, 75
— represented at the Vienna Congress, 66
Purchas, 190
Puritans, 33–64
Pym, John, 47, 48

Quivil, Peter, bishop of Exeter

Raleigh, Sir Walter, 20
Rama, Castellan of, 181
Ramsay, James, 206
Reading, charter of, 133, 136, 143
— disturbances at, 135, 136
— electioneering disturbances at, 136–138, 139, 143
Records, arrangement of, 187
— classification of, 187, 188, 198
— continuity of, 188
— East India Company, 189, 189 *n.*, 190, 191, 198
— of the African Companies, 188–220
— — — — — — their history, 197
— — — — — — — classification, 195, 196, 197
— — — first African Company, 200, 201
— — — second African Company, 201, 202
— study of, 186
Recorder, office of, 130
Rectors, mediæval, their position and income, 90, 91, 95–97, 113
Reeve, Walter the, 95
Reservation, Act of, 154
Rhine, the, 75
Richard, Thomas, 138
Riga, trade in, 183
River Elbing, 164
— Narva, 169
— Vistula, 163
Rogers, John, 174, 175
Rothomago, Robert de, 105
Roundway, 50
Rows, John, 35
Rucks, George, 166
Runton, parish of, 102, 102 *n.*
Rupert, Prince, 50, 51, 195, 199
Russell, John, 51
Russia, dispute with Turkey, 69, 72, 79, 86, 87
— Emperor of, Alexander I., 69, 78, 79, 80, 87
— hostility of, towards England, 79
— invasion of, 169
— representation of, at the Vienna Congress, 66, 79
Rye, 33

St. Albans, 145, 150
St. Nicholas' acre, 106
— — Hospital, 152
St. Petersburg, 67
St. Peter's Chalfont (Bucks), 31
Salisbury, 141
— charter of, 131, 133, 134, 146, 147, 148, 150, 151–154
Salkins, William, 175, 178
Samson, 95
Saxony, relations with Poland, 66, 69
Sborowski, family of, 180
Scotland, ecclesiastical condition of, 11
— economic life in, 3–5, 9, 10, 12, 13
— emigration from, 12, 15, 16
— growth of the nationality of, 2
— influence of great families in, 2, 3
— its commerce, 4, 5
— king of, Alexander III., 5
— — — James VI., 12
— king's return from, 46, 47
— rebellion in (1639), 24, 40, 40 *n.*, 41, 42

Seals, of Commonwealth charters, 149
Senegal, 192, 193, 211
Servientes, 92
Seven Years' War, 169
Sharp, Granville, 206
Shaw, Sir John, 200
Sheppard, William, 131, 132, 149
Shoemakers, of Salisbury, 155
Sierra Leone, 192, 193
Sigismund III., *see* Poland
Simon, Thomas, 149
Sire, Osbert, 95
Skippon, Philip, major-general, 141
Slave trade, 192, 193, 199, 201, 205–210, 213
Smith, Adam, 206
— Micha, 33
Smythe, Percy Clinton Sydney, Baron Strangford, 68
Solar, 96, 97 *n.*
Solemn League and Covenant, 53
Sound, trade in the, 163, 169, 182
Southwark, capture of, by Cromwell, 57
Spain, war with (1624), 19–20, 24
— English expedition to Cadiz (1625), 19–20
Speenham, 136
Stade, Merchant Adventurers at, 170, 176
Stapilacre, 105
Star Chamber, 33
Statutes of Iona, 12
' Steel-bow ' tenure, 14
Stevens, Joel, 137
— mayor of Reading, 138
Stevington, vicar of, 106
Stewart, Charles William, Marquis of Londonderry, 67, 76, 77, 80, 82, 84, 86
— Robert, Viscount Castlereagh, 65–88
Stoke Bliss, 105
Stone, William, 151
Stony Stratford, 141
Strafford, *see* Wentworth
Strangford, *see* Smythe
Stratton, 50
Strips, distribution of clerical in common field, 102–109.
Stuart, Sir Charles, 67
— Henry, Duke of Gloucester, 64
Sudbury, Simon of, Archbishop of Canterbury, 117
Sudermann, Henry, 167, 177
Susa, treaty of, April 14, 1629, 24 *n.*
Sviesa, gulf of, 164, 182
Swansea, 141
— charter of, 131, 133, 134, 146, 148, 150
— Guildford in, 148
Sweden, king of, Gustavus Adolphus, 25
Swinburne, Mr., 147
Sydenham, William, 131

Talleyrand-Périgord, Charles Maurice, Prince de Benevento, 70, 74
Taxation, in Scotland, 10
Thame, 141
Thirty Years' War, 25, 26
Thometon, Thomas, 201
Thurloe, Thomas, 207
Tithes, 100–102
Tooke, Horne, 197
Towerson, William, merchant, 193
Trade, in India, 191, 194
— — the Baltic, 163–184
— — W. Africa, 192, 193, 194, 195, *and passim*
Transylvania, Duke of, Berzevicius, 171, 172
Treaties, Aix-la-Chapelle, 66, 68
— Bucharest, 72
— Congress of Vienna, 65–75
— Laibach, 66
— Oxford (1643), 51
— Troppau, 66
Trench, Richard le Poer, Earl of Clancarty, 67, 68, 74
Tribal emigration, 12, 15, 16
— legislation, 6, 9, 10
— system, its defects, 7–10

Tribal economic organisation of, 3–5, 9, 10, 12, 13
—— military organisation of, 3, 4, 7, 8
Triennial Act, 47
Tromp, Marten Harpertzoon, 26, 27
Tuileries, Cabinet of the, 70
Turbary, 108
Turkey, dispute with Russia, 72, 84, 86, 87
Tyburn, *see* London

VERE, Horace, Sir, 20, 20 *n.*
Vicarage (mediæval), 92–95
Vicars, perpetual, 90, 91, 114, 115
Vieheuser, 177
Vienna, Congress of, 65–75
Villein, 111
Villiers, George, Duke of Buckingham, 22, 22 *n.*, 23
Viner, Sir Robert, 200
Virgates, 104

WALLACE, William, 8
Wallingford, 154
Walton, Robert, 166
Warin, Master, 95
Warsaw, 174
Warwick Castle, 50
Weavers, stocking, of Norwich, 155
Wellesley, Arthur, Duke of Wellington, 69
— Sir Henry, Baron Cowley, 67
Wellington, *see* Wellesley
Wentworth, Thomas, Earl of Strafford, 43, 44
Wessbroke, 105
Whipping Post, 153
Whitlocke, Lord, 136
Whydah, fort of, 211
Wilberforce, William, 206
Willoughby, Lord, 21
Wilna, 172
Wimbledon, Lord, *see* Cecil
Wolsley, Sir Charles, 131
Woodstock, charter of, 134
Wool trade, 141

YORK, grant of charter to, 130

ZAMOJSKI, Jan, 173, 179

PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO. LTD., COLCHESTER
LONDON AND ETON

REPORT OF THE COUNCIL, SESSION 1910–1911.

THE Council of the Royal Historical Society present the subjoined Annual Report to the General Meeting of the Fellows.

The public events of the year mainly covered by the last Session, of impressive significance and far-reaching importance in the history of the British Empire, are beyond the scope of the Report. A future generation of Fellows will be able to consider their true historical importance, seen in their due proportions when experience has shown their outcome. The courtesy of the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's enabled some representatives of the Society to take part in the Thanksgiving Service in St. Paul's attended by King George and Queen Mary after the Coronation.

By death the Society has lost the Bishop of Gibraltar, formerly a member of the Council, and amongst others Sir Henry Harben, a Fellow of long standing; the Rt. Hon. Sir Charles Wentworth Dilke; and Mr. W. Irvine, B.C.S.

At the ordinary meetings, in the Society's Library, the following Papers were read :—

'The Intrigue to deprive the Earl of Essex of the Lord Lieutenancy of Ireland.' By the Rev. Clement E. Pike, F.R.Hist.S. (November 17.)

'Respublica Christiana.' By the Rev. J. Neville Figgis, Litt.D. (December 15.)

'Some Aspects of Early English Apprenticeship.' By Miss O. Jocelyn Dunlop. (January 19.)

'The Possession of Cardigan Priory by Chertsey Abbey.' By H. E. Malden, *V.P. and Hon. Sec.* (March 16.)

'Notes on the Agincourt Roll.' By J. H. Wylie, D.Litt. (April 27.)

'The Ballad History of the Reign of James I.' By Professor C. H. Firth, LL.D., V.-P. (May 18.)

'The Relations between England and the Northern Powers (1689-1697).' Part I., Denmark. By Miss M. Lane, M.A. (June 15.)

The President, the Ven. Archdeacon Cunningham, D.D., LL.D., F.B.A., delivered an address on February 16, 1911.

These Papers have been printed in *Transactions,* Third Series, Vol. V.

The Alexander Medal for 1910 was not awarded. Steps have been taken to direct the studies of competitors for the medal into such channels of historical inquiry as may render the prize more useful for the purposes of research.

In addition to the above volume of *Transactions,* the following volumes of *Publications* have been or will be very shortly issued to Fellows and subscribing Libraries.

Camden, Third Series, Vol. XVIII. 'The Camden Miscellany Vol. XII.'
Camden, Third Series, Vol. XIX. 'Despatches from Paris, 1784-1789.' Vol. II. Selected and edited from the Foreign Office Correspondence by Oscar Browning, M.A., V.P.R.Hist.S.
Camden, Third Series, Vols. XX-XXI.
'John of Gaunt's Register,' edited from the Duchy of Lancaster Records, by Sydney Armitage-Smith, M.A. Vols. I. and II.

These will be followed by 'The Journal of Major-General Williamson, Lieutenant of the Tower of London, 1722-1746,' edited by John Charles Fox, F.S.A., F.R.Hist.S., Master of the Supreme Court; and 'The Essex Papers' (Series 2), 1675-1677, edited by the Rev. Clement E. Pike.

The future publications of the Society already arranged for include the newly discovered manuscripts of Carpini's 'History of the Mongols' and of the 'Narrative of the French Conquest of the Canaries, 1404-6'; 'Secret Service under George III.'; 'Documents from the Archives of the Spanish Inquisition in the Canaries'; 'The Novgorod Chronicle' (translated from the Russian text); the 'Nicholas Papers,' Vol. IV. (Camden N.S., vol. 63); the 'Diary of Margaret Lady Hoby (1599-1605)'; and the 'Estate Book of Henry de Bray (1289-1340).'

The duration of Papers read has been limited, where possible, to forty or forty-five minutes to allow opportunity for discussion. The Council are anxious to encourage the social intercourse of Fellows and their friends at the meetings, and the use of the Library by Fellows, who are reminded that the principal historical periodicals, British and foreign, are accessible in the Library on five afternoons and on Saturday mornings every week. The Library continues to increase by exchange, subscription, and the kind donations of Fellows. The Reports

of the Historical Manuscripts Commission have been nearly completed by purchase or exchange. An exchange has been arranged with the Société Jersiaise. For gifts of books the Society has again to thank Dr. Prothero and other generous donors. Camden Vol. 87, O.S. (Camden Miscell. Vol. V.), for long missing from the Library, has been supplied. The Librarian reports that 202 books and pamphlets have been added to the Library. Of the additions 16 were acquired by purchase and the rest by exchange and presentation. During the year ended October 31, 1911, 70 volumes were rebound.

The number of Fellows has been maintained. Fellows are reminded that they can materially aid the Society by the proposal of Historical scholars and students for election.

The work of the Historical Association still continues to be carried on in the Society's rooms.

The Joint Committee of Fellows of the Royal Historical Society and of American Scholars for the preparation of a Bibliography of Modern British History, which was appointed last year, is continuing its labours; but of necessity the work will last some years. Dr. Prothero has kindly undertaken the task of general editor.

The officers of the Society have been associated with the committee formed by the British Academy for the organisation of the International Historical Congress in London in 1913.

In accordance with By-law XVII. the following Vice-Presidents retired in rotation: Professor Firth, LL.D., Litt.D., and Mr. Frederic Harrison, Litt.D., and were re-elected.

The following Members of the Council retired also under By-law XVII. :—

Professor Haverfield, M.A., LL.D., F.S.A.
Mr. Seccombe, M.A., F.S.A.
Professor Oman, M.A., F.S.A.
Mr. Leadam, M.A., F.S.A.

The Secretary reports that the total membership of the Society on October 31, 1911, including Honorary, Corresponding, Life, and Ordinary Fellows, and Subscribing Libraries, was 686. Of this number 18 were Honorary Fellows, 14 were Corresponding Members, and 85 were Life Fellows. Some Ordinary Fellows still pay £1 1*s.* under the old regulations, 26 former members of the old Camden Society

pay £1, 207 Subscribing Libraries pay the same subscription, while the remainder of the Fellows pay the statutory subscription of £2 2*s*. There are 58 British and Foreign Societies which exchange *Transactions* with the Royal Historical Society.

The Treasurer is glad again to be able to report that the financial position of the Society is satisfactory. Opportunity has been taken to write off £155 5*s*. 3*d*. from the Balance Sheet valuation of the investment in Consols, the amended figure more closely representing the present value of this security. The investments have been increased by the purchase of another amount of £200 India 3½ per Cent Stock.

The Auditors report that they have examined the statement of Income and Expenditure, together with the Balance Sheet appended to this report, and have certified the same to be correct from their inspection of the books and vouchers.

ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

I.—Income and Expenditure Account relating to the Year ending October 31, 1911.

Income.	£	s.	d.
Subscriptions of 1908: 1 at 21*s.* £1 1 0			
,, 1909 1 at 21*s.* 1 1 0			
,, 1910 1 at 21*s.* 1 1 0			
,, ,, 14 at 42*s.* 29 8 0			
£32 11 0			
Less amount estimated to be received in last year's accounts for subscriptions in arrear . 8 8 0			
Subscriptions in arrear, received in excess of estimate	24	3	0
Subscriptions now in arrear estimated to be received	12	12	0
Subscriptions of 1911: 218 at 20*s.* . . . 218 0 0			
,, ,, 45 at 21*s.* . . . 47 5 0			
,, ,, 300 at 42*s.* . . . 636 6 0			
	901	11	0
Life subscriptions: 4 at £21 . . . . 84 0 0			
Less proportion required by By-Law IX. to be invested (see Balance-sheet) . . . 56 0 0			
	28	0	0
Dividends on Russian 4% Bond (Alexander Trust) . .	3	14	4
,, Consols	20	0	0
,, India 3½% Stock	16	9	8
Interest on Deposit Account at Bank	7	7	7
	£1,013	17	7

Expenditure.	£	s.	d.
Publications: Printing and Distributing . £188 8 5			
Editing and Indexing . . 8 3 0			
£196 11 5			
Less received from Sales . 10 1 1			
	186	10	4
Salaries of Director and Assistant Secretary and travelling expenses of Hon. Secretary	232	0	0
Rent of Offices	90	0	0
Coal	3	9	0
Electric Light	3	9	7
Rates	32	2	4
General Printing and Stationery	39	4	8
Library: Books, Periodicals, and Binding . . .	28	5	9
Postages, &c.	14	19	7
Sundries (Petty Cash payments)	33	11	6
Advertising	3	0	0
Insurance	2	14	0
Monthly Meetings (cost of Refreshments) . . .	7	8	6
	676	15	3
Balance, being excess of Income over Expenditure for the year ending October 31, 1911, carried to Balance-sheet	337	2	4
	£1,013	17	7

ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

II.—Balance-sheet of Liabilities and Assets at October 31, 1911.

Liabilities.

			£ s. d.
Life Subscriptions required to be invested as Capital Account (By-Law IX.): amount brought forward from last Balance-sheet	£1,094 0 0		
Proportion of Life subscriptions received in 1911 (see Income and Expenditure Account)	56 0 0		
		1,150 0 0	
[Represented by Consols, India 3½ % Stock, and Cash on Deposit see *contra*]			
Alexander Trust Fund [Russian 4 % Bond see *contra*]			98 17 6
Subscriptions received in advance			16 13 0
Balance, being surplus of Assets over Liabilities at date Viz.—Amount brought forward from last year	£2,602 15 2		2,784 12 3
Add Excess of Income over Expenditure as shown by Income and Expenditure Account	337 2 4		
	£2,939 17 6		
Deduct Amount written off value of Consols (£855 5*s.* 3*d.* reduced to £700—see *contra*)	155 5 3		
	£2,784 12 3		
			£4,050 2 9

Assets.

			£ s. d.
Consols 2½ % £849 9*s.* 9*d.* valued at			700 0 0
India 3½ % Stock £600 at cost			581 3 0
Russian 4 % Bond			98 17 6
Cash at Bank: Current a/c	£272 8 5		
Deposit Account at Bank	378 11 10		
Petty Cash Balance in hand	6 10 0		
		657 10 3	
Stock of Publications in hand, estimated value			100 0 0
,, ,, with Messrs. Spottiswoode & Co. and Messrs. W. H. Smith & Son (value as insured)			500 0 0
Library (value as insured)			1,000 0 0
,, Manuscripts (value as insured)			100 0 0
Furniture, &c. ,, ,,			300 0 0
Subscriptions in arrear estimated to be received (see Income and Expenditure Account)			12 12 0
			£4,050 2 9

(*Signed*) Henry R. Tedder, *Hon. Treasurer.*

Auditors' Report.

The above Statement of Income and Expenditure and Balance-sheet have been prepared from the Books and Vouchers, and we hereby certify the same to be correct.

Dec. 8, 1911.

(*Signed*) E. M. LLOYD
J. FOSTER PALMER
T. CATO WORSFOLD
} *Auditors.*

Royal Historical Society.

(INCORPORATED BY ROYAL CHARTER.)

OFFICERS AND COUNCIL—1911-1912.

Patron.

HIS MAJESTY THE KING.

President.

THE VEN. ARCHDEACON CUNNINGHAM, D.D., LL.D.

Honorary Vice-Presidents.

THE RIGHT HON. LORD AVEBURY, D.C.L., LL.D., F.R.S.
THE REV. J. F. BRIGHT, D.D.
THE RIGHT HON. JAMES BRYCE, D.C.L.
SIR C. E. H. CHADWYCK-HEALEY, K.C.B., K.C.
THE RIGHT HON. LORD CURZON OF KEDLESTON, G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E.
THE RIGHT HON. LORD FITZMAURICE, M.A.
JAMES GAIRDNER, C.B., LL.D.
THOMAS HODGKIN, D.C.L., Litt.D., F.S.A.
SIR HENRY HOWORTH, K.C.I.E., F.R.S.
THE RIGHT HON. THE EARL OF ILCHESTER.
THE RIGHT HON. THE EARL OF ROSEBERY AND MIDLOTHIAN, K.T., K.G., D.C.L., LL.D.
THE RIGHT HON. SIR G. O. TREVELYAN, BT., LL.D., D.C.L., D.L.
A. W. WARD, Litt.D., LL.D., Master of Peterhouse, Cambridge.
THE RIGHT HON. SIR FREDERICK POLLOCK, BT., D.C.L., LL.D.

Vice-Presidents.

H. E. MALDEN, M.A.
REV. W. HUNT, D.Litt.
OSCAR BROWNING, M.A.
THE RIGHT REV. F. A. GASQUET, D.D.
PROFESSOR C. H. FIRTH, LL.D., Litt.D.
FREDERIC HARRISON, Litt.D.
SIR J. H. RAMSAY, BT., M.A.
G. W. PROTHERO, Litt.D., LL.D.

Council.

Sir Sidney Lee, Litt.D.
Stanley Leathes, M.A.
C. L. Kingsford, M.A., F.S.A.
R. A. Roberts.
William J. Corbett, M.A.
J. Holland Rose, M.A., Litt.D.
Colonel E. M. Lloyd, R.E.
G. M. Trevelyan, M.A.
T. Seccombe, M.A., F.S.A.
Professor C. W. C. Oman, M.A., F.S.A.
I. S. Leadam, M.A., F.S.A.
R. G. Marsden, M.A.
J. F. Chance, M.A.
Professor A. F. Pollard, M.A. Litt.D.
Professor C. Raymond Beazley, D.Litt., F.R.G.S.
The Hon. J. W. Fortescue, M.A.

Honorary Secretary.

H. E. Malden, M.A.

Director.

Hubert Hall, F.S.A.

Treasurer.

H. R. Tedder, F.S.A.

Auditors.

Colonel E. M. Lloyd. J. Foster Palmer. T. C. Worsfold.

Assistant Secretary and Librarian.

Miss M. B. Curran.

Library and Offices.

6 & 7 South Square, Gray's Inn, W.C.

Bankers.

London & South Western Bank, 148 Holborn, E.C.

Royal Historical Society.

STANDING COMMITTEES—1911-1912.

Finance Committee.

J. F. Chance, M.A.
The Right Rev. F. A. Gasquet, D.D.
Rev. W. Hunt, D.Litt.
C. L. Kingsford, M.A., F.S.A.
I. S. Leadam, M.A., F.S.A.
Colonel E. M. Lloyd, R.E.
R. G. Marsden, M.A.
R. A. Roberts.
Hubert Hall, F.S.A., *Director.*
H. R. Tedder, F.S.A., *Treasurer.*
H. E. Malden, M.A., *Hon. Sec.*

Library Committee.

J. F. Chance, M.A.
The Right Rev. F. A. Gasquet, D.D.
Rev. W. Hunt, D.Litt.
C. L. Kingsford, M.A., F.S.A.
I. S. Leadam, M.A., F.S.A.
Colonel E. M. Lloyd, R.E.
R. G. Marsden, M.A.
Professor A. F. Pollard, M.A.
R. A. Roberts.
Hubert Hall, F.S.A., *Director.*
H. R. Tedder, F.S.A., *Treasurer.*
H. E. Malden, M.A., *Hon. Sec.*

Publication Committee.

Oscar Browning, M.A.
J. F. Chance, M.A.
C. H. Firth, LL.D., Litt.D.
The Right Rev. F. A. Gasquet, D.D.
Rev. W. Hunt, D.Litt.
C. L. Kingsford, M.A., F.S.A.
I. S. Leadam, M.A., F.S.A.
Colonel E. M. Lloyd, R.E.
R. G. Marsden, M.A.
Professor A. F. Pollard, M.A.
R. A. Roberts.
Hubert Hall, F.S.A., *Director.*
H. R. Tedder, F.S.A., *Treasurer.*
H. E. Malden, M.A., *Hon. Sec.*

LIST OF FELLOWS

OF THE

ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

Names of Officers and Members of Council are printed in SMALL CAPITALS.
*Those marked * have compounded for their Annual Subscriptions.*

Abbott, Rev. H. A., M.A., Eggars Grammar School, Alton, Hants.
Abram, Miss, D.Sc., 33 Gayton Road, Hampstead, N.W.
* Ackers, B. St. John, Huntley Manor, Gloucester.
Aiya, V. Nagam, B.A., Tirumalai Lodge, Trivandrum, Travancore, S. India.
Aiyangar, S. K., Chamarajendrapel, Bangalore City, India.
* Alexander, L. C., Holly Lodge, Upper Park Field, Putney.
Ali, A. F. M. Abdul, M.A., M.R.A.S., F.R.S.L., F.R.G.S., Rangpur, East Bengal, India.
* Amherst, The Right Hon. Earl, Montreal, Sevenoaks, Kent.
Anderson, John H., 5 Lexham Gardens, S.W.
Anderson, R. C., M.A., Bassett Wood, Nr. Southampton.
Anscombe, A., 30 Albany Road, Stroud Green, N.
Armstrong, Edward, M.A., Queen's College, Oxford.
Artus, A. L., 11 Emperor's Gate, S.W.
Arundale, G. S., M.A., LL.B., Central Hindu College, Benares, India.
* Ashcombe, Lord, 123 St. George's Square, Pimlico, S.W.
Astley, Rev. H. J. Dukinfield, M.A., Litt.D., F.R.S.L., East Rudham Vicarage, King's Lynn.
Atkinson, C. T., M.A., Exeter College, Oxford.
* Auden, Miss Henrietta M., Alderdene, Church Stretton, Salop.
Auden, Rev. J. E., M.A., Tong Vicarage Shifnal, Salop.
AVEBURY, The Right Hon. Lord, D.C.L., F.R.S., F.L.S., 48 Grosvenor Street, S.W.

Baer, S. L., Hochstrasse 6, Frankfort-on-Main.
*Baguley, Henry, 6 Park Road, Wandsworth, S.W.
Bagwell, R., J.P., D.L., Marlfield, Clonmel.
Baker, A. E., Public Library, Taunton.
Baker, James, Sewelle Villa, Clifton, Bristol.
Bales, P. G., B.A., The Grammar School, Doncaster.
Banks, Mrs. M. M., 7 Wadham Gardens, N.W.

* Barrett, T. Squire, M.A.I., F.Z.S., F.S.S., F.R.B.S., 18 Millfield Road, Appleton-in-Widnes.
Baskerville, G., M.A., Keble College, Oxford.
Bavanandam, S., Saravana Villas, Tannah Road, Vepery, Madras.
Baxter, Wynne E., F.R.G.S., 170 Church Street, Stoke Newington.
Bayley, A. R., B.A., St. Margaret's, Imperial Road, Great Malvern.
Beatty, H. M., M.A., LL.D., 32 Elers Road, West Ealing, W.
Beaven, Rev. A. B., M.A., Greyfriars, Leamington.
BEAZLEY, CHARLES RAYMOND, D.Litt., F.R.G.S., The University, Edmund Street, Birmingham.
Belcher, Rev. Dr., M.A., LL.D., St. Michael's Rectory, Lewes, Sussex.
Benson, Arthur Christopher, M.A., Magdalene College, Cambridge.
Bethell, G., 11 Chandos Street, Cavendish Square, W.
Bickmore, H. C., M.A., 44 Edwardes Square, Kensington, W.
Bolam, Rev. C. E., St. Mary Magdalene's Rectory, Lincoln.
Boyd, W. K., 9 Archway Road, Highgate, N.
Boynton, Thomas, Norman House, Bridlington Quay, Yorks.
*Brackenridge, George Washington, San Antonio, Texas, U.S.A.
BRIGHT, Rev. JAMES FRANCK, D.D., Hollow Hill, Ditchingham, Norfolk.
Brisco, A. N., Ph.D., The College of the City of New York, New York, U.S.A.
Briscoe, John Potter, F.R.S.L., Public Libraries, Nottingham.
Bristol, The Right Rev. the Bishop of, The Palace, Bristol.
* Brocklehurst, Septimus, F.R.G.S., Olinda, Aigburth Drive, Sefton Park, Liverpool.
Brooke, Z.N., M.A., Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge.
Brough, William S., Fowlchurch, Leek, Staffordshire.
Brown, A. E., B.A., LL.B., Lavender House, Chesterton Road, Cambridge.
Brown, Mrs. Burton, Prior's Field, Godalming.
Brown, H. G., 4 Blandford Gardens, Leeds.
Browne, Harold C. G., 15 Kingsgate Street, Winchester.
BROWNING, OSCAR, M.A., 31 Dorset Road, Bexhill-on-Sea.
Bryce, The Right Hon. James, British Embassy, Washington, U.S.A.
Burd, L. A., M.A., Repton School, near Burton-on-Trent.
Burghclere, The Lady, 48 Charles Street, W.
Burton, Rev. E. H., D.D., St. Edmund's College, Old Hall, Ware.
*Busher, Rev. T. Story, M.A., F.C.S., Barnfield, Edgmond, Newport, Salop.
Butler, G. G., M.A., Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.
* Butt, Arthur N., London Institution, Finsbury Circus, E.C.

Cape, H. J., M.A., Mathematical School, Rochester.
Capron, N. H., M.A., 3 North Gate, Regent's Park, N.W.
* Carington, H. H. Smith, Grangethorpe, Rusholme.
Carlyle, Rev. A. J., University College, Oxford.
Carlyle, E. I., M.A., Lincoln College, Oxford.
CHADWYCK-HEALEY, Sir C. E. H., K.C., 3 Harcourt House, Cavendish Square, W.
Chadwyck-Healey, G. E., K.C.B., K.C., M.A., 20 Rutland Gate, S.W.
* CHANCE, JAMES FREDERICK, M.A., 30 Lennox Gardens, S.W.
* Chancellor, E. Beresford, M.A., The Gladdy House, Wargrave, Berks.
Chapman, J. J., M.A., Oakfield, Hitchin, Herts.
Charleston, S. J., M.A., 9 Ofreslottsgatan, Uppsala, Sweden.
Charteris, The Hon. Evan, 23 St. James's Place, S.W.
Cheney, A. D., F.S.A., Lympne, Hythe, Kent.
Childs, Horatio, St. Martin's Northern Schools, Castle Street, Long Acre, W.C.
Church, George Earl, F.R.G.S., 216 Cromwell Road, S. Kensington.
Clapham, J. H., M.A., King's College, Cambridge.

Cobb, Cyril Stephen, B.C.L., M.A., F.R.G.S., 5 Cornwall Terrace, Regent's Park, N.W.
Cockle, M. J. D., Lowen Lodge, Surlingham, Norwich.
Collinson, F. J., 3 Essex Court, Temple, E.C.
Corbett, Rev. F. St. John, M.A., F.R.S.L., The Rectory, St. George's-in-the-East, E.
* Corbett, William J., M.A., King's College, Cambridge.
Courtauld, George, Cut Hedge, near Halstead, Essex.
Cozens-Smith, E., F.S.S., 16 Kensington Square, W.
Crake, Rev. Edward E., Jevington Rectory, Polegate, Sussex.
Crawford, the Right Hon. the Earl of, F.R.S., Haigh Hall, Wigan.
Cronin, Rev. H. S., M.A., Willowbrook, Chaucer Road, Cambridge.
Crowe, F. J. W., F.R.A.S., St. Peter's House, Chichester.
Cullingworth, H. E., M.A., 1 Upper Abbey Road, Belvedere, Kent.
* Cunningham, The Ven. Archdeacon, D.D., LL.D., *President*, Trinity College, Cambridge.
Curzon, The Right Hon. Lord, G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E., Hackwood, Basingstoke.
Cuthell, Mrs., Goldhill Lodge, Farnham, Surrey.

Dames, R. S. Longworth, 21 Herbert Street, Dublin.
* Davids, Professor T. W. Rhys, LL.D., Harboro' Grange, Ashton-on-Mersey, Cheshire.
* Davies, Rev. D. J., M.A., Moore College, Sydney, N. S. Wales.
Davis, F. B., B.A., 50 Greathead Road, Milverton, Leamington.
Dawson, Rev. W., M.A., Susancourt, Loughton, Essex.
Deacon, J. L., 26 High Street, Rye, Sussex.
Dealy, T. K., Queen's College, Victoria, Hong Kong.
Deas, J. A. C., Public Library, Sunderland.
Denham, Edward, 128 School Street, New Bedford, Mass., U.S.A.
* Dimelow, John Gartside, Landsmere, Palatine Road, Didsbury.
Ditchfield, Rev. P. H., M.A., Barkham Rectory, Wokingham, Berks.
Doble, C. E., 11 Mount Ararat Road, Richmond, Surrey.
Doncaster, J. H., Birchfield, Abbeydale, Sheffield.
Dudden, Rev. F. H., M.A., Lincoln College, Oxford.

* Eayrs, Rev. George, 114 Belmont Road, St. Andrews Park, Bristol.
Eckersley, James Carlton, M.A., F.R.G.S., F.S.S., Carlton Manor, Yeadon, Leeds.
* Edminson, F. J., M.A., Grove House, Leighton Park School, Reading.
Edmundson, Rev. George, M.A., 7 Hans Place, S.W.
Eeles, F.C., 1 Strathfillan Road, Edinburgh.
* Egerton, Professor H. E., M.A., 14 St. Giles, Oxford.
Elliott, C. A., M.A., Jesus College, Cambridge.
* Evans, W., The Spring, Kenilworth, Warwickshire.
* Ezard, Edward Henry, M.D., D.Sc., 12 Huntingdon Road, Cambridge.

Fanshawe, H. C., I.C.S., 72 Philbeach Gardens, S.W.
Felberman, Louis, Bladen Lodge, South Bolton Gardens, S.W.
Felce, Ernest, 2 Kingsley Road, St. Stephen's, Norwich.
Fenwick, Miss Susan F., 64 Kensington Park Road, W.
* Ferguson, John, M.A., LL.D., University, Glasgow.
* Ferrers, The Right Hon. Earl, Staunton Harrold, Melbourne, Derby.
Firth, Charles Harding, M.A., LL.D., Litt.D., 2 Northmoor Road, Oxford.
Fisher, H. A. L., M.A., 34 Norham Road, Oxford.
Fitch, Edwin F., 66 Bishopsgate Street, E.C.
Fitzmaurice, The Right Hon. Lord, Leigh House, Bradford-on-Avon, Wilts.
Fitzmaurice-Kelly, J., The University, Liverpool.

Fleming, Sandford, C.E., C.M.G., LL.D., Ottawa, Canada.
Fletcher, Banister F., F.R.I.B.A., F.S.I., 29 New Bridge Street, E.C.
* Fletcher, John S., Hadleigh, Farnham Common, Bucks.
Forrest, George W., C.I.E., Rose Bank, Iffley, Oxford.
*Fortescue, The Hon. J. W., 59A Brook Street, W.
*Fotheringham, J. K., M.A., 6 Blackhall Road, Oxford.
Fowler, W. Warde, M.A., Lincoln College, Oxford.
Fox, Francis F., F.S.A., Yate House, Chipping Sodbury, Gloucestershire.
Fox, J. C., Master of the Supreme Court, Childe Court, Streatley-on-Thames.
Free, Rev. Richard W., M.A., St. Clement's Vicarage, Fulham, S.W.
Freeman, J. J., Shepperton, S.O.
* Freeman, N. W., 29 Cambridge Square, W.

Gairdner, James, C.B., LL.D., West View, Pinner, Middlesex.
Gardiner, F. J., Trevordale, Wisbech.
Gardner, Miss Alice, Newnham College, Cambridge.
Garrett, J. P., 38 Great James Street, Bedford Row, W.C.
* Garstin, John Ribton, M.A., F.S.A., M.R.I.A., Braganstown, Castle Bellingham, co. Louth.
Gasquet, The Right Rev. Francis Aidan, D.D., Principal of the Benedictine Order in England, 16 Harpur Street, Theobald's Road, W.C.
Gee, Rev. Henry, D.D., The Castle, Durham.
Giuseppi, M. S., F.S.A., Public Record Office, Fetter Lane, E.C.
Golding-Bird, Rev. G., M.A., St. Peter's Rectory, Great Windmill Street, W.
* Gooch, G. P., M.P., M.A., South Villa, Campden Hill Road, W.
Graham, Miss Rose, 12 Ladbroke Gardens, Notting Hill, W.
Graham, Rev. W., St. Luke's Vicarage, Dukinfield, Cheshire.
Grant, Arthur J., M.A., 21 Burton Crescent, Far Headingley, Leeds.
Gray, Rev. E. D. McQueen, M.A., University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico.
Green, F. W., Home Glen, Haydon Park, Wimbledon, S.W.
Green, J. E. C., M.A., Trinity Hall, Cambridge.
Green, Mrs. J. R., 36 Grosvenor Road, Westminster, S.W.
Green, Samuel S., Free Public Library, Worcester, Mass., U.S.A.
* Green, T. J. Shipton, Warberry House, Bishop's Down, Tunbridge Wells.
Green, W. D. Huntley, Bishop's Teignton, S. Devon.
Greene, C. H., M.A., The School House, Berkhamsted, Herts.
Greene, G. A., Litt.D., 23 Pembroke Gardens, Kensington, W
Greenwood, Miss A. D., 334 Banbury Road, Oxford.
Grundy-Newman, S. A., Littleton Place, Walsall.

Habell, Rev. Mark, B.A., 6 Woodbine Avenue, Gosforth, Newcastle-on-Tyne.
Haigh, W. E., Technical College, Huddersfield.
*Hailstone, Edward, 16 Rue Boursault, Paris.
Hales, J. W., M.A., 1 Oppidans Road, Primrose Hill, N.W.
Hall, Hubert, F.S.A., *Director*, 2 Paper Buildings, Temple, E.C.
* Harrison, Frederic, Litt.D., Elm Hill, Hawkhurst, Kent.
Hartill, Rev. I., 32 Grove Park Terrace, Chiswick, W.
Hartley, Rev. E., M.A., South Lawn, Great Crosby, Liverpool.
* Harvey, William Marsh, Goldington Hall, Bedford.
Haslam, Rev. J., D.D., New College, Harrogate.
Hassall, A., M.A., Christ Church, Oxford.
* Haverfield, F., M.A., LL.D., F.S.A., Winshields, Headington Hill, Oxford.
Hay, James A.C., C.E., M.R.S.G.S., 12 Copers Cope Road, Beckenham, Kent.
Headlam, J.W., M.A., 1 St. Mary's Road, Wimbledon.

* Hearnshaw, F. J. C., M.A., LL.D., 4 Collingwood Terrace, Newcastle-on-Tyne.
Heaton, R. W., M.A., Government Library, Pretoria, S. Africa.
Heaton, Rev. W. J., Grasington, Prince of Wales's Road, Dorchester.
Henderson, B. L. K., M.A., A.K.C., 3 Perryn Road, Acton, W.
Henson, Very Rev. H. Hensley, The Deanery, Durham.
Hewitt, Charles R., 55 Warwick Road, Ealing, W.
Hewlett, Maurice, 7 Northwick Terrace, N.W.
Hill, J. J. T., The School House, Deane, Bolton, Lancashire.
Hill, Lady, Leighton House, near Heston, Cheshire.
Hill, Samuel Thomas, F.R.G.S., Stebonhethe, Northcote Road, St. Margaret's, Twickenham.
Hitchin-Kemp, F., Clyderhous, 51 Vancouver Road, Forest Hill, S.E.
Hoare, E. G., B.A., Monkton Combe School, near Bath.
Hoare, S. J. G., B.A., Sidestrand Hall, Cromer.
Hockaday, F. S., Highbury House, Lydney, Glos.
Hodgkin, J. Eliot, The Woodlands, Upper Richmond Road, Putney, S.W.
Hodgkin, Thomas, D.C.L., F.S.A., Barmoor Castle, Beal, Northumberland.
Hodgson, Shadworth Hollway, 45 Conduit Street, W.
Hoggarth, A. H. G., M.A., St. Abbs, Kendal.
Holmes, T. Rice, Litt.D., 11 Douro Place, Kensington, W.
Holmes, Rev. Chancellor T. Scott, M.A., East Liberty, Wells, Somerset.
Hooper, George N., Elmleigh, Hayne Road, Beckenham, S.E.
Hopkins, Rev. C. E., M.A., Grafton Underwood Rectory, Kettering.
Horne, Rev. W., St. Luke's Vicarage, Wilton, Blackburn.
* Horrocks, J. W., M.A., D.Litt., Gill Terrace, Moston Lane, Blackley, Manchester.
Hough, H., 597 Bury Road, Bolton, Lancashire.
Howard-Watson, J. A., F.R.G.S., F.R.S.L., 12 Waterloo Road, Waterloo, near Liverpool.
Howorth, Sir Henry, K.C.I.E., F.R.S., 30 Collingham Place, S.W.
Hughes, William E., 89 Alexandra Road, South Hampstead.
Hunt, Rev. William, M.A., D.Litt., 24 Phillimore Gardens, Campden Hill, W.
Hyamson, A. M., The White House, College Road, Cheshunt, Waltham Cross.

*Ilchester, The Earl of, Holland House, Kensington, W.
Innes, A. D., M.A., Intelecote, Marsham Way, Gerrard's Cross.

Jackson, Rev. Canon F. J. Foakes, M.A., D.D., Jesus College, Cambridge.
Jackson, Rev. H. Latimer, B.D., Little Canfield Rectory, Dunmow, Essex.
Jenkinson, C. H., M.A., 29 Cheyne Road, Chelsea, S.W.
Jones, Rev. E. Humphrey, The Rectory, Lydiard Tregoz, Swindon, Wilts.

Keate, Miss E. M., Hampton Court Palace, S.W.
Kelway, A. C., 22 Old Square, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.
Kemp, Thomas, J.P., 10 Jury Street, Warwick.
His Highness Kerala Varma, C.S.I., Trivandrum, Travancore, India.
Kingsford, C. L., M.A., F.S.A., 13 Brunswick Gardens, Campden Hill, W.
*Kirkpatrick, F. A., M.A., 54 Hereford Road, W.
Kirkpatrick, Robert, 1 Queen Square, Strathbungo, Glasgow.
Kitchener, E. E., M.A., 23 Cameron Road, West Croydon.
Kitto, John Vivian, 32 Overstrand Mansions, Battersea Park, S.W.
* Knaus, C. T., F.R.G.S., 28 Marlborough Road, Bradford.
Kozminsky, Isidore, D.Sc., 3 First Floor, Fink's Buildings, Melbourne.
Krishna, T. Rama, B.A., Thottakaddan House, Poonamalli Road, Madras, India.
Kushal Pal Sinh, Rais of Kotla, Kotla, Agra, India.

Lander, Rev. W. B., 75 Brunswick Street, Leamington.
Langhorne, W. B., Whitmore, Chulmleigh, N. Devon.
Langley, Rev. A. S., 39 Chaplin Road, Longton, Staffs.
Lapsley, G. T., M.A., Ph.D., Trinity College, Cambridge.
Law, Miss A., Knight Hill, Padiham, Lancs.
Lawrence, R. V., M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.
LEADAM, ISAAC SAUNDERS, M.A., 21 Cadogan Gardens, S.W.
LEATHES, STANLEY, M.A., 5 Paper Buildings, Temple, E.C.
Leighton, H. R., East Boldon, R.S.O., Co. Durham.
* Leonard, Miss E. M., 1 Lindfield Gardens, Hampstead, N.W.
*Lepper, R. S., M.A, LL.M., c/o H. S. King & Co., 65 Cornhill, E.C.
Lewis, E. A., M.A., D.Sc. (Econ.), University College of Wales, Aberystwyth.
* Liberty, Arthur Lasenby, F.R.S.S., F.Z.S., J.P., The Manor House, The Lee, near Great Missenden, Bucks.
Limbrick, W. A., Springfield, Leinster Road, Muswell Hill, N.
Little, Andrew G., M.A., Risborough, Vine Court Road, Sevenoaks.
Littler, H. D., M.A., Pocklington School, E. Yorks.
LLOYD, Colonel E. M., R.E., Glenhurst, Brighton Road, Sutton.
Lloyd, Professor J. E., M.A., Gwaen Deg, Bangor.
Lloyd, Richard Duppa, 2 Addison Crescent, Kensington, W.
* Lobb, John, F.R.G.S., 40A Emmanuel Road, Telford Avenue, Streatham Hill, S.W.
Lockhart, Arthur W., Carnwathlee, Bedfont, Feltham, Middlesex.
* Lodge, Professor R., M.A., 25 Hope Terrace, Edinburgh.
Lomas, Mrs. S. C., Rosslyn, Upper Sydenham, S.E.
Lucas, Frank W., Ferndale, Westcombe Park Road, Blackheath, S.E.
Lucas, Rev. H., M.A., Lancing College, Shoreham, Sussex.
Luck, H. Courtenay, F.R.G.S., J.P., Courtenay, Zillmere, Brisbane, Queensland.
* Lydall, John French, 37 John Street, Bedford Row, W.C.
* Lyle, Thomas, M.A., The Hollies, 41 Beckenham Road, Beckenham, Kent.
Lytell E. S., M.A Homelands, Banister Road, Southampton.

MacArthur, Miss E. A., Litt.D., 61A St. Andrew's Street, Cambridge.
Macdermot, T. B., B.A., LL.D., Crewkerne Grammar School, Somerset.
Madeley, Rev. Walter, M.A., School House, Woodbridge.
Maguire, T. M., M.A., LL.D., Earl's Court Square, S.W.
MALDEN, HENRY ELLIOT, M.A., *Hon. Sec.*, 17 Rose Hill, Dorking.
Markham, Miss V., Tapton House, Chesterfield.
Marriott, W. K., Manor House, Great Baddow, Essex.
*MARSDEN, R. G., M.A., 13 Leinster Gardens, Lancaster Gate, W.
Marsh, Dr. G. W. B., B.A., 40 Tachbrook Street, S.W.
* Marten, C. H. K., M.A., Eton College, Windsor.
Mason, W. A. Parker, M.A., The Perse School, Cambridge.
Mathews, E. R. N., Public Libraries, Bristol.
Mathur, Tikait Narain, B.A., 63/9 Chili-end Road, Agra, India.
Mercer, W. J., 12 Marine Terrace, Margate.
Merriam, C. P., 79 Highbury New Park, N.
Merriman, Roger B., M.A., 26 Quincey Street, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.
Miles, Colonel S. B., c/o Messrs. H. S. King & Co., 9 Pall Mall, S.W.
Modi, E. M., D.Sc., F.C.S., F.R.G.S., Meher Buildings, Tardeo, Bombay, India.
Money-Coutts, Francis Burdett, Walsingham House, Piccadilly.
Montague, F. C., 177 Woodstock Road, Oxford.
Moon, Zebedee, Public Library, Leyton.
* Moore, Norman, M.D., 94 Gloucester Place, Portman Square, W.
Morris, A., Gwynfa, Gold Tops, Newport, Mon.
Morris, J. E., D.Litt., 27 De Parys Avenue, Bedford.

Morrison, Hew, Public Library, Edinburgh.
Mullens, W. H., Westfield Place, Battle, Sussex.
Munich, Charles J., The War Office, Whitehall, S.W.
Munro, J. J., 18 Leyhorne Avenue, Northfield, Ealing, W.
Myres, Rev. M. W., M.A., The Vicarage, Frodsham, Cheshire.

Naidu, P. V. R., Financial Secretary's Office, Hyderabad, Deccan, India.
Neve, A. H., Pinnacles, Tonbridge.
Newbolt, H. J., Netherhampton House, Salisbury.
Newland, H. O., Cambrian Lodge, 66 Knollys Road, Streatham, S.W.
Nichols, John Bruce, Parliament Mansions, Victoria Street, S.W.
Nihjoff, Martinus, The Hague.
Norgate, Rev. T. T., F.R.G.S., The Church House, Westminster Abbey, S.W.
Northampton, The Most Honourable the Marquis of, K.G., 51 Lennox Gardens, S.W.
Northumberland, His Grace the Duke of, K.G., 2 Grosvenor Place, S.W.
Nuttall, J. R., Thornfield, Lancaster.

O'Connor, Major G. B., Illane Roe, Rochestown, Co. Cork.
*Oke, A. W., B.A., F.S.A., 32 Denmark Villas, Hove, Sussex.
Oman, C. W. C., M.A., F.S.A., All Souls College, Oxford.
Osborn, J. Lee, Bevis, Great Somerford, near Chippenham, Wilts.
Osborne, H. Claude, 20 Malmains Road, Dover.
Owen, R. K. W., M.A., Highfield, 19 Upper Maze Hill, St. Leonards-on-Sea.

Palmer, James Foster, L.R.C.P., M.R.C.S.E., 8 Royal Avenue, Chelsea College, S.W.
Pape, F. J., Cockermouth, Cumberland.
* Parker, L. N., F.R.A.M., 3 Pembroke Road, Kensington, W.
Parkin, Thomas, M.A., F.R.G.S., Fairseat, High Wickham, Hastings.
* Parr, J. Charlton, Grappenhall Heyes, Warrington.
Partington, S., 1 Hazelwood Terrace, Grange-over-Sands, Lancs.
Paterson, A., 6 Thurlow Road, Hampstead, N.W.
Patterson, James K., Ph.D., LL.D., President of the State University, Lexington, Kentucky, U.S.A.
Pembroke, The Right Hon. the Earl of, F.R.G.S., Wilton House, Salisbury, Wilts.
Penelt, G. B., M.A., 153 Chesterton Road, Cambridge.
Penney, Arthur Paul, 18 Bedford Place, W.C.
Penney, N., Devonshire House, Bishopsgate, E.C.
Perkins, Rev. J., M.A., 4 Dean's Yard, Westminster, S.W.
* Perry, Colonel Ottley, J.P., F.R.G.S., F.S.A., Roxwell, Northwood, Middlesex.
Pflugk-Harttung, Professor Dr. Julius von, 23 Spenerstrasse, Berlin, N.W.
Pierce, Rev. F. Dormer, M.A., The Vicarage, Southend-on-Sea.
Pierce, Rev. P. R., B.A., 39 Wretham Road, Handsworth, Birmingham.
*Pike, Rev. Clement E., 13 Taunton Road, Bridgwater.
Pink, W. Duncombe, J.P., Winslade, Lawton, Newton-le-Willows, Lancs.
Poland, Sir Harry, K.C., 28 Sloane Gardens, S.W.
* Polignano, Duke of, Manor House, Brampton, Huntingdon.
* Pollard, A. F., M.A., Litt. D., Branksea, 7 St. Mary's Grove, Barnes Common, S.W.
Pollock, Sir F., Bt., LL.D., F.S.A., 13 Old Square, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.
Pope, F. J. 17 Holland Road, Kensington, W.
* Porges, Theodore, F.R.G.S., 17 Avenue Friedland, Paris.
Powell, Ellis T., LL.B., B.Sc. [Econ.], Rosedene, Brondesbury Park, N.W.
Powell, Miss H. L., 4 Orsett Terrace, Bishops Road, W.
Pratt, A. T. C., 6 Templar Street, Camberwell, S.E.
Prothero, G. W., M.A., Litt.D., LL.D., 24 Bedford Square, Bloomsbury, W.C.

Prothero, M. E. D., M.A., Office of Inspector of European Schools, 245 Bow Bazaar Street, Bengal, Calcutta.
Prothero, R. E., M.A., 3 Cheyne Walk, Chelsea, S.W.
Purnell, E. K., M.A., North Hill, Windlesham.
Pym, Guy, 35 Cranley Gardens, S.W.

Raby, F. J. E., B.A., Bloomsbury House Club, Cartwright Gardens, W.C.
Radice, Mrs. Charles, Fernwood, Wimbledon Park, S.W.
Ragg, Rev. F. W., M.A., The Manor House, Lower Boddington, Byfield, R.S.O.
Rait, R. S., M.A., New College, Oxford.
RAMSAY, Sir JAMES HENRY, Bt., M.A., Alyth, Banff, N.B.
Rangaswami-Aiyangar, K. V., M.A., H.H. Maharaja's College, Trivandrum Travancore.
Rankin, J. R. Lea, Walterstone, Abergavenny.
* Rashdall, Rev. H., M.A., New College, Oxford.
Ravenshaw, J., B.A., 10 West Hill, Highgate, N.
* Reddaway, William F., M.A., King's College, Cambridge.
Redstone, V. B., Mill Hill, Woodridge.
Reichel, Sir H. R., M.A., Principal, University College, Bangor.
Reid, Miss R. R., M.A., D.Lit., 4, Grange Road, Gunnersbury, W.
Relton, Rev. F., F.K.C., St. Andrew's Vicarage, Stoke Newington, N.
Renshaw, Walter Charles, K.C., Sandrocks, Haywards Heath.
Reynolds, J. W., M.A., Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge.
Rickword, G., 38 Wellesley Road, Colchester.
Rimmer, Rev. J. S., B.A., 6 Sheen Park, Richmond, Surrey.
Rittenberg, R. J., B.A., B.Sc., Langton, Bude, N. Cornwall.
ROBERTS, R. A., Public Record Office, W.C.
Robertson, A., M.A., 25 Mansion House Road, Edinburgh.
* Robinson, Wilfrid C., 13 Wulfhage Street, Bruges, Belgium.
Ropes, Arthur Reed, M.A., 31 Addison Road, Kensington, W.
ROSE, J. HOLLAND, Litt.D., Walsingham, Millington Road, Cambridge.
* ROSEBERY, The Right Hon. the Earl of, K.G., 38 Berkeley Square, W.
Ross, Lieut.-Col. Wm. G., The National Provincial Bank of England, Limited, 88 Cromwell Road, S.W.
* Routh, Miss E. M. G., The Manor House, Wendover, Bucks.
Routledge, Mrs. Scoresby, M.A., Ewers, Bursledon, Hants.
Rushmore, F. M., M.A., St. Catharine's College, Cambridge.
* Russell, Hon. Rollo, Dunrozel, Haslemere.
* Russell, Colonel W., R.E., Ravelin House, Portsmouth.
Ryley, Miss Caroline, Priors Field, Godalming.

Sadler, H. W. W., Bridlington College, Yorkshire.
* Safford, John Burham, F.G.S., 18 Elgin Road, Wallington, Surrey.
*Salter, F. R., M.A., Magdalene College, Cambridge.
Samaddar, J. N., Patna Government College, Moradpur P.O., Patna, India.
Saunders, H. W., M.A., 53 Elmwood Road, West Croydon.
Scott-Gatty, Sir A. S., Garter King of Arms, College of Arms, E.C.
SECCOMBE, THOMAS, M.A., 18 Perryn Road, Acton, W.
* Seebohm, Hugh Exton, Poynders End, Hitchin.
Sellers, Miss M., D.Litt., St. Catherine's, Richmond Park Avenue, Bournemouth
Serjeantson, Rev. R. M., M.A., F.S.A., St. Peter's Rectory, Northampton.
* Shawcross, G. W., Lakelands, Rivington, Lancs.
Shawcross, Rev. W. H., Bretforton Rectory, Honeybourne S.O., Worcs.
Shelley, Sir J. C. E., Bart., Avington, Alresford, Hants.
Shelley, R. J. A., Denbie House, Formby, Lancs.
Sherren, John Angel, J.P., Penn Hill Avenue, Parkstone, Dorset.
Sieveking, A. F., 12 Seymour Street, Portman Square, W.

Silvester, Rev. J., M.A., The Vicarage, Clacton Magna, Essex.
Simon, A. L., 24 Mark Lane, E.C.
* Simpson, Edward, Walton Hall, Wakefield.
Simpson, F. A., M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.
* Simson, Alfred, 32 Brompton Square, S.W.
Skeel, Miss C. A. J., Litt.D., Holly Hedge Cottage, Well Road, Hampstead, N.W.
Skrine, F. H., 147 Victoria Street, S.W.
Smart, F. W. B., Charterhouse, Godalming.
Smith, A. L., M.A., The King's Mound, Oxford.
Smith, S. H., B.A., The Priory, Windermere.
Smith, Samuel, Public Libraries, Sheffield.
Smith, W. O., B.A., Bankura College, Bengal, India.
Smythe, David M., Methuen Castle, Perth.
Snowball, F. C., M.A., King Edward VII. School, Lytham, Lancs.
Soper, H. T., The Monastery, Waverley Avenue, Exeter.
Sotheran, H. C., 5 Cheyne Walk, Chelsea, S.W.
Southam, Lionel Arthur Clement, Rodney House, Malvern Link.
Spens, H. B., B.A., 25 Park Circus, Glasgow, N.B.
St. Cyres, Viscount, Pynes, Exeter.
*Stampa, L., M.A., 120 Greencroft Gardens, Hampstead, N.W.
Stanley, Rev. J., Sunny Side, Longhope, Glos.
Steele, J., M.D., 92 Kensington Gardens Square, W.
Stenton, F. M., M.A., Wantage Hall, Reading.
* Strathcona and Mount Royal, The Right Hon. Lord, 28 Grosvenor Square, W.
Synge, Miss M. B., 30 Royal Avenue, Chelsea, S.W.

Talboys, R. St. Clare, M.A., Wellington College, Berks.
Tanner, J. R., M.A., St. John's College, Cambridge.
Tatham, G., M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.
Taylor, R. W. Cooke, High Trees, Chepstow.
TEDDER, H. R., F.S.A., *Hon. Treasurer*, The Athenæum, Pall Mall, S.W.
* Temperley, H. W. V., M.A., Peterhouse, Cambridge.
Terry, Rev. G. F., F.S.A., F.R.S.L., St. John's Rectory, 10 Learmonth Terrace, Edinburgh.
Thistlethwaite, B., Gribdale Cottage, Great Ayton.
Thomson, Miss C. L., 51 Eaton Rise, Ealing, W.
Thornton, Percy M., M.P., 30 Evelyn Gardens, South Kensington, S.W.
Thornton, Rev. Canon F. S., Shudy Camps Hall, Bartelow, Cambs.
Thorp, John T., F.R.S.L., 57 Regent Road, Leicester.
Titcombe, Rev. J. C., Seckford Hospital, Woodbridge.
Torbitt, William S., M.A., Education Offices, Ilford.
Torr, Herbert James, Morton Hall, Swinderby, Lincs.
Tout, Professor T. F., M.A., 55 Mauldeth Road, Withington, Manchester.
Traherne, L. E., Coedarhydyglyn, Cardiff.
* TREVELYAN, G. M., 2 Cheyne Gardens, S.W.
TREVELYAN, The Right Hon. Sir G. O., Bt., D.C.L., LL.D., D.L., 8 Grosvenor Crescent, S.W.
Turner, Fred A., Killarney, Windmill Road, Brentford, W.
* Turton, Robert Bell, Kildale Hall, Grosmont, Yorks.

Udal, The Hon. John Symonds, F.S.A., The Manor House, Symondsbury, Bridport.
Unwin, G., M.A., 47 Heaton Road, Withington, Manchester.

Ventura, M., 17 Coleman Street, E.C.
Verney, Lady, Claydon House, Winslow, Bucks.
* Vickers, K. H., M.A., 100 Ridgmount Gardens, Gower Street, W.C.
Vinogradoff, Paul, Court Place, Iffley, Oxford.

Wade, C. E., M.A., 3 Lampard House, Maida Hill West.
* Wagner, Henry, F.S.A., 13 Half Moon Street, Piccadilly, W.
Wale, W., Guy's Hospital, St. Thomas's Street, S.E.
* Walker, Philip F., F.R.G.S., 36 Prince's Gardens, S.W.
* Walker, Robert, F.R.G.S., Westry, Combe Down, Bath.
* Wallace, Sir Donald MacKenzie, St. Ermin's Mansions, Caxton Street, S.W.
WARD, ADOLPHUS WILLIAM, Litt.D., LL.D., Master of Peterhouse, Cambridge.
Ward, the Rev. Canon Bernard, St. Edmund's College, Old Hall, Ware.
Ward, J. S. M., B.A., Glen House, Rivelin, Sheffield.
Wardell, Professor J. H., M.A., M.R.I.A., The Abbey, Shanagolden, Co. Limerick.
Warren, Lieut.-General Sir Charles, K.C.B., F.R.S., R.E., 10 Wellington Crescent, Ramsgate.
Watson, E. J., St. John's Arch, Bristol.
* Watts, Rev. Herbert C., 8 Manor Road, Fishponds, Bristol.
Weaver, F. J., Selborne, Rayne Road, Braintree, Essex.
Weaver, Rev. F. W., M.A., F.S.A., Milton Vicarage, Evercreech, Somerset,
Weaver, L., F.S.A., 14 Northwick Terrace, N.W.
Webb, Sidney, LL.B., 27 Norfolk Street, Strand, W.C.
Webb, T., 45 High Street, Andover.
Webb, W. H., 29 Waldeck Road, Nottingham.
Webster, C. K., M.A., King's College, Cambridge.
Welby, The Right Hon. Lord, G.C.B., 11 Stratton Street, W.
Wesley, E. F., 28 Essex Street, Strand, W.C.
* Whatton, J. S., M.A., Chilworth, Torquay.
Wheeler, H. F. B., Hartlebury, Roy Road, Northwood, Middlesex.
White, A. J., B.A., Mundy Street, Heanor, Derbyshire.
Whitehead, A. W., 14 Hartington Place, Eastbourne.
Whitehead, Sir James, Bart., Wilmington Manor, near Dartford, Kent.
Whiteley, J. G., 223 West Lanvale Street, Baltimore, U.S.A.
Whitley, Rev. W. T., M.A., LL.M., 53 West Cliff, Preston.
Whitney, Rev. J. P., 9 Well Walk, Hampstead, N.W.
Whitwell, Robert J., B.Litt., 69 Banbury Road, Oxford.
Wilkinson, M., M.A , 9 Upton Park, Slough, Berks.
Willcock, Rev. J., M.A., D.D., St. Ringan's Manse, Lerwick, N.B.
Williams, A. J., M.A., Burton Bank, Mill Hill, N.W.
Williams, Basil, M.A., 34 Cheyne Road, Chelsea, S.W.
Williams, E. P., Elmhurst, Westcombe Park Road, Blackheath, S.E.
Williams, J. W., B.A., Dunmurry House, Co. Antrim.
Williams, Dr. Thos. E. H., R.N. Recruiting Depot, 17 Bath Street, Bristol.
Williamson, A., M.A., 8 York Road, Rathmines, Co. Dublin.
Wills-Sandford, Miss Mary, 40 St. Giles, Oxford.
Wilmot-Buxton, Miss E. M., Wistons, Dyke Road, Hove.
Wilson, H. W., 203 Elgin Avenue, W.
Winstanley, D. A., M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.
Wood, William, 28 St. Mary-at-Hill, Eastcheap, E.C.
* WORSFOLD, THOMAS CATO, M.A., F.R.S.L., LL.D., Hall Place, Mitcham, Surrey.
Wright, W. H. K., Free Library, Plymouth.
Wyles, Thomas, F.G.S., King's Newton Cross House, Melbourne, Derby.
Wylie, J. H., M.A., D.Litt., 4 Lawn Road, Hampstead, N.W.

Young, Rev. David, D.D., 15 Hawley Square, Exeter.
Young, Hubert Edward, Claremont, 147 Banbury Road, Oxford.

HONORARY FELLOWS.

* Brown, P. Hume, M.A., LL.D., William Fraser Professor of History in the University of Edinburgh, 20 Corrennie Gardens, Edinburgh.

Dana, Edward S., Ph.D., New Haven, Connecticut, U.S.A.

Gorostiraga, Don Angel de, National Archæological Society, Conde de Aranda 6, Madrid.

* Hewins, Professor W. A. S., M.A., 98 St. George's Square, S.W.

Lee, Sir Sidney, Litt.D., 108 Lexham Gardens, S.W.
Liversidge, Professor A., M.A., F.R.S., LL.D., Hornton Cottage, Hornton Street, Kensington, W.
* Lyte, Sir H. C. Maxwell, K.C.B., M.A., F.S.A., Deputy Keeper of the Public Records, 3 Portman Square, W.

Montelius, Dr. Oscar, Society of Antiquaries, Stockholm, Sweden.
Montjau, M. Edouard M. de, Society of Ethnography, Paris.

Oppert, M. Julius, Professor of Assyrian Philology and Archæology in the College of France, Place des Ecoles, Paris.

Pomialovsky, His Excellency Professor John, Imperial University, St. Petersburg.
* Poole, R. L., M.A., Ph.D., University Lecturer in Diplomatic, Oxford, Mansel House, Museum Road, Oxford.

Roberts, Field-Marshal the Rt. Hon. Earl, K.G., United Service Club, London, S.W.

Slafter, Rev. Edmund F., A.M., D.D., 249 Berkeley Street, Boston, U.S.A.
Stieda, His Excellency Professor Dr. Ludwig, Königsberg University, Germany.

Thompson, Sir Edward Maunde, G.C.B., C.I.S.O., D.C.L., LL.D., Litt.D., F.B.A., Mayfield, Sussex.

Waxel, Platon L. de, Ph.D., Vice-Director of the Chancery of Foreign Affairs, Place du Palais 6, St. Petersburg.

* Honorary Life Fellows under By-law IV. (since repealed).

CORRESPONDING MEMBERS.

Andrews, C. M., Ph.D., Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, M.D., U.S.A.

Balzani, Count Ugo, D.C.L., 9 Via Po, Rome.
Bémont, Chas., Directeur-Adjoint à l'Ecole des Hautes-Etudes, 14 Rue Monsieur le Seine, Paris (VIE).
Brock, R. A., 517 West Marshall Street, Richmond, Virginia.
Broglie, Le Duc de, Rue Solférino, Paris.
Busch, Professor Wilhelm, Ph.D., Neckarhalde 3F., Tübingen.

Davis, N. Darnell, C.M.G., Royal Colonial Institute, London.

Haskins, C. H., Ph.D., Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.

Jameson, Professor J. F., Ph.D., LL.D., Department of Historical Research, Carnegie Institution, Washington, U.S.A.

Liebermann, Professor Felix, Ph.D., LL.D., 10 Bendlerstrasse, Berlin, W.

Ravenell, H. E., Spartanburg, South Carolina, U.S.A.

Sarolea, Prof. Charles, Belgian Consulate, Edinburgh.

Theal, G. McCall, LL.D., c/o Colonial Secretary, Cape Colony, South Africa.

Villari, Professor P., Senato del Regno, Florence.

LIST OF SUBSCRIBING LIBRARIES

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

Abbaye St. Pierre de Solesmes, Quarr Abbey, Ryde, I.W.
Aberdeen University. Librarian, Peter J. Anderson.

Belfast, Queen's College. Librarian, A. L. Meissner.
Birkenhead Public Library. Librarian, John Shepherd.
Birmingham Library, Margaret Street. Librarian, Charles Edward Scarse.
Central Free Library, Ratcliffe Place, Birmingham. Librarian, A. Capel Shaw.
University. Librarian, W. H. Cope.
Bolton Central Reference Library, Town Hall Square. Librarian, Archibald Sparke, F.R.S.L.
Brighton Public Library, Royal Pavilion. Librarian, H. D. Roberts.

Cambridge, Girton College. Librarian, Miss Allen.
King's College. Librarian, G. Chawner, M.A.
St. Catharine's College. Librarian, Rev. W. T. Southward, M.A.
St. John's College. Librarian, J. B. Mullinger, M.A.
Trinity College. Librarian, Rev. R. Sinker, D.D.
University Library. Librarian, F. J. H. Jenkinson, M.A.
Canterbury, Dean and Chapter Library.
Cardiff Public Library. Librarian, H. Farr.
Carlisle Public Library, Castle Street, Carlisle.
Chiswick Public Library, Duke's Avenue. Librarian, H. T. Hewitt.

Dewsbury Public Library. Librarian, W. H. Smith.
Dublin, King's Inn Library. Librarian, James McIvor.
National Library of Ireland, Kildare Street. Librarian, T. W. Lyster, M.A.
Royal Irish Academy, 19 Dawson Street. Librarian, S. A. J. Cole.
Trinity College. Librarian, Rev. T. K. Abbott, Litt.D.
Durham University. Librarian, E. V. Stocks, M.A.

Edinburgh, Advocates' Library. Keeper, W. K. Dickson.
Library of the Writers to the 'Signet.'
University. Librarian, A. Anderson.

Glasgow, Baillie's Institution, 153 West Regent Street. Librarian, J. C. Ewing.
Faculty of Procurators' Library, 62 St. George's Place. Librarian, John Muir.
Mitchell Library, 21 Miller Street. Librarian, Francis T. Barrett.
University Library. Librarian, James Lymburn.
Gloucester Public Library, Brunswick Road. Librarian, Rowland Austin.
Grimsby Public Library. Librarian, D. H. Geddie, F.R.Hist.S.

Hoey Public Library. Librarian, J. W. Lister.
Hull Public Library. Librarian, William F. Lawton.

Ireland, National Library of (*see* Dublin).

Leeds Church Institute. Secretary, W. Raynor.
Leeds Library, Commercial Street, Leeds. Librarian, David Augustus Cruse, M.A.
Leicester Free Library, Wellington Street. Librarian, Charles Vernon Kirkby.
Leicester Permanent Library, Gallowtree Gate. Librarian, F. S. Herne.
Lincoln, Dean and Chapter Library.
Liverpool, Athenæum Library, 40 Church Street. Librarian, George T. Shaw.
Public Library.
University.
London, The Admiralty, S.W.
The Athenæum Club. Librarian, H. R. Tedder, F.S.A.
Battersea Public Libraries, Lavender Hill, S.W. Librarian, Lawrence Inkster.
Board of Education, Whitehall, S.W.
British Museum.
Chelsea Public Library, Manresa Road. Librarian, J. H. Quinn.
Gray's Inn. Librarian, M. D. Severn.
Guildhall Library. Librarian, E. M. Borrajo.
Hammersmith Carnegie Central Library. Librarian, Samuel Martin.
House of Commons. Librarian, R. C. Walpole.
Inner Temple. Librarian, J. E. Latton-Pickering.
Kensington Public Library, High Street. Librarian, H. Jones.
The Law Society, Chancery Lane. Librarian, W. M. Sinclair.
Lincoln's Inn. Librarian, A. F. Gray Etheridge.
London Institution, Finsbury Circus, E.C. Librarian, R. W. Frazer, LL.B., M.R.A.S.
London Library, St. James's Square, S.W. Librarian, C. H. Hagberg Wright, LL.D.
London University, South Kensington, S.W.
Middle Temple. Librarian, C. E. A. Bedwell.
National Liberal Club, Whitehall, S.W. Librarian, F. G. Haley.
National Portrait Gallery.
New University Club, St. James's Street, S.W.
Oxford and Cambridge Club.
Passmore Edwards Public Library, Pitfield Street, Shoreditch, N. Librarian, W. C. Plant.
Public Record Office.
Reform Club, Pall Mall, S.W. Librarian, Charles W. Vincent.
Royal Institution, 21 Albemarle Street, W.
St. George's Public Library, Buckingham Palace Road, S.W. Librarian, Frank Pacy.
St. Paul's Cathedral Library. Librarian, Rev. W. P. Besley.
Sion College Library, Victoria Embankment, S.W. Librarian, Rev. W. H. Milman.
Southwark Central Library and Cuming Museum, Walworth Road, S.E. Librarian, R. W. Mould.
United University Club, 1 Suffolk Street, S.W.

London, University College, Gower Street, W.C.
Westfield College, Hampstead, N.W. Librarian, Miss C. A. J. Skeel, M.A.
Dr. Williams's Library, Gordon Square, W.C. Librarian, F. H. Jones.

Manchester Public Libraries. Librarian, Charles W. Sutton.
The John Rylands Library.
Victoria University. Librarian, C. W. E. Leigh.
Middlesbrough Free Library, Municipal Buildings. Librarian, Baker Hudson.
Mirfield House of the Resurrection. Librarian, Rev. W. H. Frere.

Newcastle-upon-Tyne Literary and Philosophical Society. Librarian, Basil Anderton, B.A.
Newcastle-on-Tyne Public Library. Librarian, Basil Anderton, B.A.
Norfolk and Norwich Library.
Norwich, Dean and Chapter Library.
Nottingham Free Public Library. Librarian, J. Potter Briscoe.

Oldham, Union Street Library.
Oxford, All Souls College. Librarian, Prof. C. W. Oman, M.A., F.S.A.
Balliol College. Librarian, John Alexander Smith, M.A.
Bodleian Library.
Exeter College. Librarian, Rev. W. C. Allen, M.A.
Keble College.
Magdalen College. Librarian, H. A. Wilson, M.A.
Manchester College.
Merton College.
Queen's College. Librarian, Rev. E. M. Walker, M.A.
St. John's College. Librarian, Rev. C. F. Burrey, M.A.
Union Society.

Preston Library (Dr. Shepherd's).

Reading Free Public Library, Blagrave Street. Librarian, Wm. H. Greenhaugh.
Rugby Public Library. Librarian, J. W. Kenning.

St. Andrews University. Librarian, James Maitland Anderson.
St. Deiniol's Library, Hawarden. Librarian, Rev. G. C. Joyce.
Southport Free Library. Librarian, F. H. Mills.
Stonyhurst College, Whalley, Lancs.

Wimbledon Public Library. Librarian, H. W. Bull.
Windsor Royal Library, Windsor Castle. Librarian, The Hon. J. W. Fortescue.
Workington Public Library. Librarian, J. W. C. Purves.

York Public Library. Librarian, A. H. Furnish

BRITISH COLONIES.

Adelaide Public Library, S. Australia. Librarian, J. G. R. Adams.
Adelaide University, S. Australia. Librarian, R. J. M. Clucas.

Benares Central Hindu College, India.
Bishop's College, Lennoxville, Quebec, Canada. Librarian, Rev. H. F. Hamilton, B.D.
Brisbane, Public Library.
Brisbane, University of Queensland, Australia.
Bulawayo Public Library. Librarian, E. F. Miller.

Halifax Legislative Library, Nova Scotia.

Johannesburg Public Library, South Africa. Librarian, J. F. Cadenhead.

Melbourne, Library of the Parliament of the Commonwealth.
Melbourne Public Library, Victoria. Librarian, Dr. T. F. Bride.

New Zealand, General Assembly Library.

Otago University, Dunedin, New Zealand.
Ottawa, Library of the Parliament.

Perth Public Library, Western Australia.
Pretoria Government Library, Pretoria, S. Africa. Librarian, R. W. Heaton, M.A.

Rhodes University College, Grahamstown, South Africa. Librarian, R. J. Cholmeley.

Sydney Public Library. New South Wales.
Sydney University, New South Wales. Librarian, H. E. Barft.

Toronto Legislative Library, Canada. Librarian, Avern Pardoe.
Public Library, Canada. Librarian, James Bain.

Victoria Legislative Library, British Columbia, Canada. Librarian, E. O. Scholefield.

FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

AUSTRIA.

Vienna, K. K. Universitäts-Bibliothek.

DENMARK.

Copenhagen Royal Library. Chief Librarian, Dr. S. Birket Smith.

FRANCE.

Paris, Bibliothèque du Ministère de la Guerre. Librarian, A. Lemoine.
Bibliothèque Nationale. Director, Léopold Delisle.
Institut National.
Université de Paris.

GERMANY.

Berlin, Bibliothek des Deutschen Reichstages.
Königl. Bibliothek. General Director, Prof. Aug. Wilmanns.
Bonn Royal University.
Breslau, Königl. Universitäts-Bibliothek. Director, Wilhelm Erman.

Erlangen, University Library.

Freiburg, University Library. Chief Librarian, Prof. Dr. Julius Steup.

Göttingen, Königl. Universitäts-Bibliothek. Director, Prof. Karl Dziatzko.
Greifswald, Königl. Universitäts-Bibliothek. Director, Fritz Milkau.

Halle, Königl. Universitäts-Bibliothek. Director, Karl Gerhard.
Hamburg, City Library. Librarian, Dr. Alfred Küster.
Heidelberg, University Library. Chief Librarian, Prof. Jakob Wille.

Königsberg, Königl. Universitäts-Bibliothek. Director, Karl Boysen.

Marburg, Königl. Universitäts-Bibliothek. Director, Johannes Rödiger.
Munich, K. B. Hof-Staats-Bibliothek. Director, Dr. Georg v. Laubmann.

Prague, University Library.

Strassburg, Kaiserliche Universitäts- und Landes-Bibliothek.

HOLLAND.

Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale.

RUSSIA.

Moscow, Library of the Imperial University.

SWEDEN.

Stockholm, Royal Library. Chief Librarian, Graf Karl Johan Gustav Snollsky.

UNITED STATES.

Baltimore, Enoch Pratt Library. Librarian, Bernard C. Steiner, Ph.D.
Boston Athenæum. Librarian, Charles K. Bolton.
Public Library. Librarian, James L. Whitney.
Brunswick, Maine, Bowdoin College. Librarian, G. P. Little.
Bryn Mawr College, Pennsylvania. Librarian, Miss I. E. Ford.

California University Library, Berkeley, California. Assistant Librarian, J. D. Layman.
Chicago Public Library. Librarian, Frederick H. Hild.
Newberry Library. Librarian, J. V. Cheney.
University. Librarian, Zella Allen Dixon.
Cincinnati Public Library, Ohio.
Cornell University Library, Ithaca, New York. Librarian, G. W. Harris.

Dartmouth College Library, Hanover, New Hampshire.

Grand Rapids Public Library, Grand Rapids, Mass.
Grosvenor Public Library, Buffalo, New York.

Harvard University Library, Cambridge, Mass. Librarian, Wm. C. Lane.

Illinois University, Urbana.
Indiana State Normal School, Terre Haute, Indiana.
Indiana University.

Jersey City Free Library. Librarian, Miss Esther E. Burdick.

Kansas State Historical Society, Topeka.
Kansas University, Lawrence, Kansas.

Massachusetts, Wellesley College. Librarian, Miss C. F. Pierce.
Michigan, Detroit Public Library. Librarian, H. M. Utley.
Hoyt Public Library, Saginaw, East Side. Librarian, Miss H. H. Ames.
State Library, Lansing. Librarian, Mrs. Mary C. Spencer.
University, Ann Arbor. Librarian, T. C. Koch.
Milwaukee Public Library. Librarian, G. W. Peckham.
Minneapolis, Athenæum Library.
Minnesota University. Librarian, Wm. W. Folwell.
Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass. Librarian, Miss B. E. Blakely.

Nebraska, University of, Lincoln, Nebraska.
Newark Free Public Library, New Jersey. Librarian, John Cotton Dana.
New Orleans, Howard Memorial Library. Librarian, W. Beer.
New York Public Library. Chief Librarian, J. S. Billings.
State Library. Librarian, Melvil Dewey.
Columbia University. Librarian, James H. Canfield.
General Theological Seminary.

Peabody Institute, Baltimore, Maryland.
Pennsylvania University. Librarian, Morris Jastrow.
Philadelphia Library Company. Librarian, J. G. Barnwell.
Pittsburg, Carnegie Library. Librarian, E. H. Anderson.
Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey. Librarian, E. C. Richardson.
Providence, R.I., Brown University. Librarian, H. L. Koopman.

San Francisco Free Public Library. Librarian, G. T. Clark.
South Bethlehem, Pa., Lehigh University. Librarian, Professor J. L. Stewart.
Springfield City Library, Mass. Librarian, Hiller C. Wellmann.
St. Louis Public Library, Missouri.

Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, New York.
Virginia State Library, Richmond, Va. Librarian, J. P. Kennedy.

Washington, Catholic University of America. Librarian, J. M. Cooney.
Congress Library. Librarian, Herbert Putnam.
Wisconsin, State Historical Society of. Librarian, I. S. Bradley.

Yale University, New Haven, Conn. Librarian, Addison Van Name.

HISTORICAL SOCIETIES IN GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

WHICH EXCHANGE TRANSACTIONS WITH THE ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

Society of Antiquaries, Burlington House, London, W.
Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, Queen Street, Edinburgh.
The Hon. Society of Cymmrodorion, 63 Chancery Lane, W.C.
Surrey Archæological Society, Guildford.
Jewish Historical Society, Mocatta Library, University College, Gower Street, W.C.

HISTORICAL SOCIETIES ABROAD

WHICH EXCHANGE TRANSACTIONS WITH THE SOCIETY.

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY.

Kaiserl. Akad. der Wissenschaften, Vienna.
Königl. böhmischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, Altstadt, c. N^{r} 562, Prague.

BELGIUM.

Académie Royale des Sciences, des Lettres et des Beaux-Arts, Palais des Académies, Brussels.
Académie Royale d'Archéologie de Belgique, Rue du Transvaal, 53, Antwerp.
Société d'Archéologie de Bruxelles, 11 Rue Ravenstein, Brussels.

CANADA.

Toronto University.
Archives of the Department of Agriculture, Ottawa.

CAPE OF GOOD HOPE.

South African Library, Cape Town.

DENMARK.

Société Royale des Antiquaires du Nord, Copenhagen.

FRANCE.

Bibliothèque de l'Université de Toulouse, 2 Rue de l'Université, Toulouse, Haute-Garonne.
Revue des Etudes Napoléoniennes, 108 Boulevard St. Germain, Paris.
Société de l'Histoire de France, 60 Rue des Francs-Bourgeois, Paris.
Société d'Histoire Diplomatique, 18 Rue Vignon, Paris.
Société de l'Ecole Nationale des Chartes, 17 Rue de la Sorbonne, Paris.
Société des Antiquaires de l'Ouest, 20 Rue de l'Est, Poitiers.

GERMANY

Historische Litteraturgesellschaft, Friedensstrasse 11, Berlin.

HOLLAND.

Commissie van Advies voor Rijks Geschied-kundige Publicatien. The Hague.
Historisch Genootschap, Utrecht.

ITALY.

Reale Archivio, Florence.
Reale Academia dei Lincei, Rome.
Reale Academia Lucchese di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti, Lucca.
R. Società Romana di Storia Patria, Rome.
Società di Storia Patria per la Sicilia Orientale, Catania, Sicily.

MEXICO.

Museo Nacional, D.F., Mexican Republic, Mexico.

NOVA SCOTIA.

The Nova Scotia Historical Society, Halifax, N.S.

PORTUGAL.

Academia Real das Sciencias, Lisbon.
Portugalia, Rue do Conde, 21, Porto.

ROUMANIA.

Academia Romana, Bucharest.

RUSSIA.

Russian Imperial Historical Society, St. Petersburg.
Société Impériale Russe d'Archéologie, St.-Pétersbourg.
Bibliothèque de l'Université impériale de Juriew, Juriew (Dorpat), Russia.

SOUTH AMERICA.

Academia Nacional de la Historia, Caraccas, Venezuela.

SPAIN.

Real Academia de la Historia, Calle del Leon, 21, Madrid.

SWEDEN.

Kongl. Vitterhets Historie Antiquitets Akademien, National Museum, Stockholm.
The Royal Society of Antiquaries of Sweden, Stockholm.
The University, Upsala.

SWITZERLAND.

Allgemeine Geschichtsforschende Gesellschaft der Schweiz, Stadt Bibliothek, Berne.
Historische und Antiquarische Gesellschaft, Basel, Sonnenweg, 15.

UNITED STATES.

The Smithsonian Institution, Washington.
The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore.
New England Historic-Genealogical Society, 18 Somerset Street, Boston, Mass.
The New York Historical Society, 170 Second Avenue, New York.
The Historical Society of Pennsylvania, 1300 Locust Street, Philadelphia.
The Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.
The Rhode Island Historical Society, Providence, R.I.
The Virginia Historical Society, 707 East Franklin Street, Richmond, Va.
The Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore.
The South Carolina Historical Society, Charleston, S.C.
The New Jersey Historical Society, West Park Street, Newark, N.J.
The New Hampshire State Library, Concord, U.S.A.
The Connecticut Historical Society, Hertford, Conn.
American Antiquarian Society, Worcester, Mass.
Texas State Historical Society, Austin, Texas.
Illinois Historical Society, Springfield, Illinois.
Maine Historical Society, Portland, Maine.

The Council are not responsible for the accuracy of the foregoing list, but they request that any inaccuracy or omission may be pointed out to the Secretary, and that all changes of address may be notified to him, so that delay in forwarding communications and the Publications of the Society may be avoided.

BIBL. LONDIN. UNIV.

PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO. LTD., LONDON
COLCHESTER AND ETON

SHL
WITHDRAWN